

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 216

CG 015 199

AUTHOR Ryan, Carol Crawford
TITLE Adult Student and Faculty Expectations of Academic Advising in a Nontraditional University.
PUB DATE Oct 80
NOTE 105p.: Master's Thesis, University of Minnesota.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Students; Counselor Role; Delivery Systems; *Educational Counseling; *Expectation; *Faculty Advisers; Higher Education; Noncampus Colleges; *Nontraditional Students; Student Attitudes; *Student College Relationship; *Student Needs

ABSTRACT

New students and faculty have expressed a growing interest in academic advising. However, little research has been reported about adult students and the academic advising process. A survey of adult students and faculty members at Metropolitan State University, a nontraditional university, showed that faculty members were sensitive to their role as advisers, but required additional training to meet the needs of adult students. Scheduling time for school and financing their education were the major concerns of the students. Many students wanted to change careers and expected help from the university: they were also interested in evening and weekend advising hours and tutorial workshops. Results suggest that high expectations on the part of faculty and students require good communication skills and ready access to information. Advising systems must be diversified to meet the needs of adult students.

(JAC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED203216

ADULT STUDENT AND FACULTY EXPECTATIONS
OF ACADEMIC ADVISING IN A
NONTRADITIONAL UNIVERSITY

A Plan B Paper
Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Minnesota

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts
in Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

Carol Crawford Ryan

October 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol C. Ryan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CG 015199

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Reynold Willie for his advice and his good work as an academic advisor. Thanks go to Howard Williams, an able mentor, and to L. Sunny Hansen for her suggestions and encouragement. Appreciation is also expressed to Associate Dean for Advising Elizabeth Shippee and to the students and faculty at Metropolitan State University who participated in the study.

Gratitude is extended to David Crockett, The American College Testing Program, Dean Charles Morris, University of Michigan and Dr. Thomas Grites, Stockton State College who helped an unknown graduate student.

A special thanks to L. J. Ryan for his continuous encouragement during this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	viii
 Chapter	
1. THE NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	2
Plan of the Study.....	3
Design of the Study.....	3
Procedures.....	4
Analysis of the Data.....	4
Limitations.....	5
Significance.....	5
Overview of Content.....	6
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	7
Introduction.....	7
Definition of Terms.....	8
Theoretical Models of Academic Advising.....	9
General Advising Models.....	9
Adult Advising Models.....	11
Advising Delivery Systems.....	13

The Advising Process.....	14
Student and Faculty Expectations of Academic Advising.....	15
Adult Student Concerns.....	22
Student Services.....	23
3. THE DESIGN AND DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY.....	26
Introduction.....	26
The Problem	26
Hypotheses and Questions.....	27
Description of the Institution and the Populations.....	28
Metropolitan State University.....	28
The Advising Program.....	28
Populations.....	29
Formulation of the Research Tool.....	31
Data Collection.....	34
Students.....	34
Faculty.....	34
Data Analysis.....	35
Limitations of the Study.....	35
Summary.....	36
4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	37
Purpose and Organization of the Data.....	37
Hypotheses and Questions.....	37
Results.....	38
Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	38
Adult Student Concerns.....	44
Contact.....	49
Student Services.....	50

Related Questions.....	52
Summary.....	70
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	73
Summary of Purpose and Methodology.....	73
Study Conclusions.....	74
Implications of the Study.....	76
Recommendations for Further Research.....	79
Conclusion.....	79
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	81
APPENDICES.....	91
A. Academic Advising Student Survey.....	91
B. Academic Advising Survey (Faculty).....	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Faculty Responses to Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	39
2. Student Responses to Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	41
3. t-Test Comparisons for Significant Differences Between Adult Students and Faculty on Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	43
4. Faculty Perceptions of Adult Student Concerns.....	45
5. Adult Student Concerns.....	46
6. t-Test Comparisons for Significant Differences Between Adult Students and Faculty on Adult Student Concerns.....	48
7. Student and Faculty Responses to Questions on Advisor/Advisee Contact.....	51
8. Student Responses to Advising Services They Would Use.....	53
9. A Comparison of Faculty and Student Responses By Sex, On Contact Questions.....	54
10. A Comparison of Student Responses, By Age, To Questions Concerning Advisor/Advisee Contacts.....	56
11. A Comparison of Faculty Responses, By Years Served as Advisors, To Contact Questions.....	57
12. A Comparison of Student Responses, By Sex, On Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	59
13. Student Responses, By Age, To Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	60
14. Faculty Responses, By Sex, To Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	63
15. Faculty Responses, By Years Served as Advisors, On Important Aspects of Academic Advising.....	65

16.	A Comparison of Adult Students' Concerns, By Sex.....	67
17.	A Comparison of Adult Students' Concerns, By Age.....	68
18.	A Comparison of Faculty Perceptions, By Sex, of Adult Student Concerns.....	71
19.	A Comparison of Faculty Perceptions, By Years Served as Advisors, of Adult Student Concerns.....	72

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Age of Student Respondents.....	30
2. Faculty Academic Advising Experience.....	31
3. Likert Scale for Questionnaire.....	32

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Academic Advising Student Survey.....	91
B. Academic Advising Survey (Faculty).....	94

Chapter 1

THE NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

Today there is a growing interest in academic advising among faculty and administrators in colleges and universities across the country. Academic advisors are engaged in additional training and institutions are reexamining their advising delivery systems. A new organization, the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), whose 500 members are administrators and practitioners of academic advising, held its fourth annual conference in October 1980. And, recognizing this emerging interest in the field, the American College Testing Program has recently compiled two comprehensive advising resource documents and has completed a two-year national survey (1977-1979) in which 820 institutions of higher education responded to questions about their academic advising programs.

Crockett (1978b, p.1.1), listed six reasons for the new focus on academic advising:

- (1) A recognition that academic advising is an integral and necessary part of the higher education process.
- (2) A concern for individual student growth and development.
- (3) An interest in increasing student retention.
- (4) Greater student choice of curriculum than ever before.
- (5) An increase in the number of nontraditional students on campus.
- (6) A growing concern by students about the linkage between

their academic preparation and the world of work.

College and university administration and faculty are concerned about declining and changing enrollments. They are beginning to recognize that it is more economical to retain current students than to continually recruit from a shrinking pool of prospective candidates. And, there is some evidence that students who develop linkages, or bonds, to an institution are more likely to stay and complete their work than those who do not. Effective advising provides those bonds to the college or university and is an important factor in student satisfaction with the school experience.

Academic advising has changed over the years. Today, the process should involve more than signing schedule cards and informing students of graduation requirements. A number of new theoretical models have been proposed since 1970 and advisors are now expected to offer developmental assistance to students as well as to provide specific information about courses and institutional policies and procedures. If advisors are to engage in such a comprehensive advising process, more research and training in academic advising is needed.

Finally, today's student body counts more nontraditional students, including those over age twenty-five, among its numbers. This change in enrollment patterns has created a need for adequate services for adult students, including delivery of appropriate and effective academic advising.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

While considerable research has been completed on academic advising for the traditional eighteen to twenty-two year old student, little work has been reported concerning adult students and the academic advising process. What are adult students' expectations of the advising experience during

their college or university years? How do faculty view their role as advisors to adults? Are their perceptions of what should take place in the advising process similar to the adults they serve? What concerns do adult students have as they return to school and are faculty aware of these same concerns? Finally, what student services would be useful to this special population? This study was conducted in order to provide more information about such issues by describing and comparing responses of new adult students and faculty members at Metropolitan State University to questions concerning expectations of academic advising.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

Design of the Study

Questionnaires were designed by the author to be administered to all incoming Metropolitan State University students, twenty-five years of age and older, and to all permanent faculty members during spring quarter 1980. It seemed appropriate to designate Metropolitan State University for such a study since most of the students attending the University in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota are adults. The average age of students is thirty-five. Demographic information was asked of each group. Questions concerning frequency and type of advising contact were raised. Fifteen aspects of academic advising, identified through the literature, were listed and students and faculty, using a Likert Scale, were asked to rate the degree of importance of each item. Adult student concerns, identified through the literature, were also listed and each group using a Likert Scale was asked again to determine the degree of concern adult students might have. Finally, students only were asked to check possible Advising Office services they would use if offered.

Procedures

The questionnaires and cover letters were approved by the Advising Office and Office of Research at Metropolitan State University and the Committee on Human Subjects at the University of Minnesota. The author visited all of the sections of Metropolitan State University's introductory course, Individualized Educational Planning, during spring quarter 1980, and presented the questionnaire to students there. Since this course is required of all new students, the total population could be reached. No attempt was made to contact students who were absent on the night their class was surveyed. All permanent faculty members were asked to complete the questionnaire at a faculty meeting in May 1980, and questionnaires were mailed to those not present. A follow-up memorandum was sent one week later, and, two weeks after that, a reminder was mailed.

Analysis of the Data

All of the data from the questionnaires were punched on data processing cards and entered into a computer file. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for the demographic information and for questions on contact, advising aspects, or factors, and adult student concerns. A count was taken of responses to the questions on student services. Standard statistics were calculated for the questions on important aspects of academic advising and adult student concerns and means for each group were ranked. Based on the assumption that a Likert Scale is a continuous interval scale, t-tests were run between student and faculty responses as a comparative measure.

LIMITATIONS

There are three specific limitations to the present study.

- (1) The data collected concerning adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising at Metropolitan State University are not necessarily typical of faculty and adult students at other institutions of higher learning. Metropolitan State University is a nontraditional, competence-based institution whose students are predominantly adults; this would differ from traditional university populations.
- (2) The data were collected and analyzed according to the variables of group, sex, age and years of service as a faculty advisor. The selection of these variables eliminated consideration of other variables which might be important in analyzing adult student advising needs and expectations.
- (3) The items selected for inclusion in the questionnaires have rationale and verification in the literature and in the experience of those who advise students at Metropolitan State University; however, they have not been statistically verified.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There are problems in conducting such a descriptive study. Brady (1978) pointed out that many new students may not know exactly what they will require from the advising system and from their relationship with their own advisor. They may respond to questions such as the items on advising

services they would use, but not actually avail themselves of the services or functions they have listed as important to them. Finally, they may respond to questions in the area of student concerns in a way that they perceive as socially acceptable. However, because academic advising is an integral part of the university structure for students and because the literature verifies that adult students (having often had previous advising experience) can identify their own advising needs and concerns, such a study of advising expectations seems significant, both to others who work with adult students and to Metropolitan State University advisement personnel.

OVERVIEW OF CONTENT

This paper has opened with Chapter 1 specifying the problem--adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising--and has discussed the design, significance and limitations of the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature, including definition of key terms, advising delivery systems, the advising process, theoretical models of advising, advising expectations and perceptions of students and faculty, adult student concerns, and student services for adults. Chapter 3 will review the design and conduct of the study, Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the data, and Chapter 5 will discuss implications of the data and suggest further research directions.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

A review of the literature reveals little reported research on the adult student and academic advising. Grabowski (1976) wrote that educational counseling for older students is the most impoverished area in adult education. He cited three reasons: lack of serious commitment by the education community, lack of adequate literature and lack of clear-cut role distinctions between counseling and academic advising. Because of the lack of adult advisement literature, it was necessary to review the literature concerning advising for the traditional eighteen to twenty-two year old student and to use the information and the small body of materials on adult students in order to provide a theoretical base for this study. Adult education, counseling and academic advising materials were reviewed and a ten-year ERIC search was carried out. Three bibliographies were consulted: Grites's bibliography in Academic Advising: Getting Up Through The Eighties, (1979) and the two annotated bibliographies contained in the American College Testing Program's Academic Advising - A Resource Document, (1978), and the 1979 supplement to that resource.

Based on the literature review, three areas were selected for consideration: recent theoretical models of academic advising, advising delivery systems and the advising process. These three topics provide the framework for a better understanding of student and faculty expectations of academic advising, adult student concerns and student services for adults. Each of

the topics will be discussed in this chapter. Definitions of terms related to the study will also be presented.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Four key terms are defined for purposes of this study. They are adult student, adult development, academic advisor and the advising process.

Adult Student

The adult student has been defined as a beginning or returning student who is twenty-five years of age or older. This definition is supported in the literature by such writers as Bishop and Van Dyk (1977), Clarke and Trombley (1978), and Bostaph (1976).

Adult Development

Because developmental aspects are increasingly emphasized as a part of the total advising process, a definition of adult development has been included. The author has accepted Knox's (1977, p. 9) concept of adult development as

...orderly and sequential changes in characteristics and attitudes that adults experience over time.

Academic Advisor

There is confusion among writers in the field as to the use of advisor and counselor and the terms are often used interchangeably. Grites (1979, pp. 8-9) reflects the new emphasis on developmental aspects of advising in his definition of an advisor.

The advisor serves as a facilitator of communication, a coordinator of learning experiences through course and career planning and academic progress review, and an agent of referral to other campus agencies as necessary.

The Advising Process

Advising itself is both a learning and teaching process according to Bostaph (1976), Crookston (1972) and Grites (1979). Titley (1978) suggested that a critical part of advising may be helping the student learn an effective decision-making process. Kramer and Gardner (1977) wrote that advising encompasses two parts: informational and developmental. While most advising consists of an exchange of information, principally pertaining to academic progress, there is increasing emphasis on student development as a part of the process. Brady (1978, p. 10) defined academic advising as

...a service delivery system which includes either or both of the following processes: The provision of accurate, current information regarding academic requirements, policies, procedures and resources of the institution to students...[and] the provision of help or assistance to the student according to his or her needs, in academic, professional, vocational and personal matters.

With the move to more advisor involvement in student development, new models of academic advising, including integrated delivery systems, have been proposed. Recent advising models are the focus of the following section.

THEORETICAL MODELS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

A number of theoretical models of academic advising encompassing process (information and development) and systems have been developed since 1970. Most have been designed for the traditional student population; a few are specifically aimed at adult or nontraditional students. Four general models, cited in most of the advising literature, and three models for older students are summarized here.

General Advising Models

O'Banion (1972) proposed a five step advising model sequence which

should be followed by the advisor and advisee in the order given. The five steps are:

- (1) Exploration of life goals.
- (2) Exploration of vocational goals.
- (3) Program choice.
- (4) Course choice.
- (5) Scheduling courses.

A team approach to advisement using student (peer) advisors, faculty advisors and professional counselors is advocated. By advisor-advisee concentration on vocational and life goals, student development will be enhanced.

Crookston (1972) proposed a systems approach to advising in which decision-making is shared and the focus is on student development. In this way the entire academic community will become a learning environment and teaching will take place in multiple settings including advisor/advisee contacts.

Grites (1977) developed a matrix format, the 4 X 4 Model, in which he identified four major functions to be performed in academic advising. An integrated personnel approach in carrying out these functions was recommended. The functions are:

- (1) Primary: The student and a centralized staff of specialists and paraprofessionals deal with course requirements, scheduling, and appropriate instructors.
- (2) Professional: Faculty advisors provide advisees with information in their specific subject areas, on graduate schools and on career development in their fields.
- (3) Personal: Advisors should be trained to recognize personal

concerns of students as they affect academic progress and should make appropriate referrals if necessary. Counseling Center personnel should also be involved in this function.

- (4) Programmatic: The advisor should be aware of on and off campus resources which might meet an advisee's needs and goals.

In Grites's matrix these four functions take place during process through postview stages. They begin with the admissions process and end after a student leaves, or graduates, when the alumni office, or placement center, might seek information about students' perceptions of their own development in relationship to the university.

Titley (1976) also followed a matrix system in presenting a model based on creative decision-making. The five dimensions in the model are: intellectual, social, emotional, spiritual and physical--all identified as student needs by Brumbaugh and Berdie (1952). These levels parallel a pyramid of creativity researched by Taylor (1959) and encompass expressive, productive, inventive, innovative and emergentive levels. Titley (1976, p. 130) believed that creativity can be fostered in every student through the advising process and that the advisor should act as a facilitator of academic progress, improved decision-making and creative achievement.

While most of these models might be appropriate for adult students as well as for the 18-22 year old learners, three models have been proposed specifically for the older student population.

Adult Advising Models

Borland (1973) constructed a new nontraditional academic advising model, based on his belief that, heretofore, academic advising has been a failure

ADVISING DELIVERY SYSTEMS

In the past, advising services have generally been delivered by faculty members and have consisted principally of informing students of requirements for graduation and for specific majors. A number of factors have contributed to changes in advising delivery systems: shifting enrollment patterns, greater curriculum choice, other responsibilities and demands on faculty, and student concerns. As a result Grites (1979, p. 5) wrote that

"Today, this process is performed by a wide range of personnel, requires much more information, involves comprehensive academic and career planning, and impacts on almost every other institutional function."

Even so, faculty still retain their role as primary providers of advising in most institutions of higher learning. Seventy-nine percent of all advising programs reporting in A National Survey of Academic Advising, Final Report (Carstensen and Silberhorn, 1979) indicated that this was their major delivery method.

A second delivery system, the centralized office of student affairs, or university advisement center, developed in the community colleges in the late 1950's and 1960's. The system provides an integrated personnel approach to advising by utilizing a combination of professional staff advisors, counselors, faculty and other appropriate university personnel to meet student needs. Another more recent delivery method is peer advising often used in residence halls or during orientation. Carstensen and Silberhorn reported that thirty-one percent of the responding programs used some type of peer advising as part of their system.

Some other components of current delivery systems include computer-assisted advising, self-advising, group advisement and advising contracts (Grites, 1979; Kramer and Gardner, 1978). Fletcher and McCauley (1978)

reported on college outreach advising efforts.

While delivery systems vary from campus to campus, some general agreement as to what should take place during the advising process has been expressed by writers and practitioners in the field. The next section discusses important aspects of the advising process identified by advisors and administrators of advising programs.

THE ADVISING PROCESS

Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979) surveyed two-year, four-year public and four-year private postsecondary institutions. They asked representatives of each school to rank the most common advising functions in the advising programs on their campuses. Returns showed five major activities. Results were identical for all three types of institutions. They were:

- (1) Provide assistance in course selection and class scheduling.
- (2) Provide academic regulation and registration information.
- (3) Assist students in developing career plans.
- (4) Assist students in exploration of life goals.
- (5) Provide personal counseling. (p. 11)

Kramer and Gardner (1977) described the informational and developmental aspects of the advising process. Information includes technical assistance and policy or system interpretation. Eighty percent of advising, they say, is informational and, if an advisor gives out inaccurate information, it is unlikely that a good advising relationship will follow.

Developmental assistance, according to these authors, means meeting the needs of the student as he/she works to determine goals and abilities and to gain greater self-knowledge. It may also mean dealing with conflict resolution, often with authority. The advisor may act as a role model to the

student in some of these instances.

Hardee (1970) listed three functions of advising to be acted on by the advisor and student during the advising process. They are:

- (1) Discussing the purpose of the institution in its teaching-learning mission.
- (2) Perceiving the purpose of the student learners.
- (3) Promoting these possibilities in conference with the student learner.

Crockett (1978b, p.1.3) elaborated on these points. He suggests that through the advising process the advisor:

- (1) Helps students clarify values, goals and self-understanding.
- (2) Helps students understand the nature and purpose of higher education.
- (3) Provides accurate information about educational options, requirements, policies and procedures.
- (4) Helps in planning an educational program consistent with a student's interests and abilities.
- (5) Assists students in continual monitoring and evaluation of educational program.
- (6) Integrates the institution's resources to meet the student's needs.

In the first portion of the literature review some important aspects of the advising process were identified and delivery systems and theoretical models of advising were reviewed. Common terms used in the field and in this study were defined. This background allows us to explore recent research on student and faculty expectations of advising, concerns of adult students and advising services for adults.

STUDENT AND FACULTY EXPECTATIONS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

Both Grites (1974) and Crockett (1978b, 1979) reviewed the literature to determine student expectations of academic advising. Grites stated that college students expect accurate information about programs, careers and institutional procedures; want personal interest shown in them; and expect relevance in teaching from faculty. Crockett (1978b, p. 1.38) lists four major factors students identified as most important to them. They are:

- (1) Accessibility.
- (2) Specific and accurate information.
- (3) Advice and counsel.
- (4) A caring and personal relationship with their advisor.

In a similar study at the University of Michigan from 1970-73, Dean Charles Morris (1973a, pp. 1-13) reported that students in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts were surveyed as to their satisfaction with the advising process and system. As a result of that survey, students ranked their needs as follows:

- (1) Information giving. Students wanted advisors to be familiar with courses and content.
- (2) Short-term course selection.
- (3) Discerning the purpose of the institution. Students wanted to know more about their fields and wanted an orientation to the school.
- (4) Student development. Students expected advisors to be interested in them as individuals and to help them be more aware of themselves and their relationship to the college.
- (5) Long-range program and course planning. Students wanted to know more about alternative careers open to them and about

courses that would help them determine their own interests.

Faculty expectations of advising are sometimes divergent from student responses. Glennon (1972) noted that faculty are reluctant to admit that they are not familiar with requirements, policies and procedures. Further, he wrote that faculty advisors are not comfortable in personal counseling roles nor do they believe in their significance in student development. They may feel threatened by students except in teaching roles. Generally, advising is not included as part of the faculty member's contract and no extra pay or recognition is given for advising. Perhaps because of these reasons, faculty members do not devote the time to advising that they do to teaching or research. Potter (1979) noted that the institution may have different expectations of advisors than do students; advising may be measured in terms of numbers served and costs of service.

Borgard, Hornbuckle and Mahoney (1977) reported a study of faculty perceptions of responsibility as advisors. Faculty were divided on the importance of advising. Some questioned student need for advising and some questioned their ability and obligation to help students in exploring career and life goals. The authors' conclusions were that prospective college teachers had not been prepared for their role as student advisors. Furthermore, the individual's interests, competences and personality played an important part in determining whether or not he/she would be an effective advisor.

Most of the research on student and faculty expectations of advising has been carried out by doctoral students. Related research has dealt with student and faculty satisfaction with their academic advising experience. In many studies a satisfaction scale has been developed and some personal interviews have been held with advisors. Nine of these studies and their findings are reviewed here.

At the University of Iowa, Rosenberg (1969) undertook a study of undergraduate advising in The College of Liberal Arts. He devised a satisfaction scale which dealt with the advisor's interest in the student, accessibility to the advisee, frequency of advising contact, discussion of topics other than academic, and advisor warmth. He reported that advisee satisfaction was not related to length of time the student had been assigned to a specific advisor; however, advisee satisfaction did increase with the frequency of contacts. Satisfaction increased with the length of meetings (average time was fifteen to thirty minutes) and students who had been given referral suggestions were more satisfied than those who had not received such information. Advisees who had taken part in group advising were more satisfied than those who had not had that experience and advisees who wished to do so, and had contact with their advisors outside the advising process, reported greater satisfaction than those who did not.

However, students thought that the College advising was a failure because advisors did not know them personally, were inaccessible and were lacking in policy and procedural knowledge. Rosenberg included students who were twenty-five years of age and older in his study and the satisfaction responses were the same for this group as the younger sample.

When faculty reported to Rosenberg, some suggested that advising was not necessary--students should read the catalog. Some felt that students did not avail themselves of advising services; others were relieved when advisees did not appear because they did not believe they could handle all who had been assigned to them.

A. G. Peterson (1970) developed an instrument (The College Advisement Survey) in order to measure student perceptions of college advising. His scales dealt with functions of advisement, style of advisor and advising outcomes. As a result of his study seven stable subscales were

validated: class selection, vocational, personal, support, relationship, effects, and satisfaction. Tiede (1976) built on Peterson's study by using the same instrument to evaluate faculty advisement programs at three small liberal arts colleges in Wisconsin. In all three colleges the advising experience was perceived positively by students except on the personal subscale.

Grites (1974) developed the Advising Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) which was a combination of the instruments developed by Rosenberg, Peterson and Murray (1971). He used the instrument to survey student perceptions of academic advising in the areas of advisor interest, accessibility, frequency of contact, discussion of other topics, knowledge of regulations, warmth, personal knowledge of the student, ability to decrease enrollment errors, and overall advisee satisfaction. He was also interested in investigating the relationship of faculty members as teachers and advisors to undergraduate students. Students reported that they wanted a warm personal relationship with their advisor and that the advising role was not as effectively performed as the teaching role by most faculty members. Faculty, on the other hand, thought that the quality of their teaching and advising performances were nearly the same.

Bostaph (1976) described student attitudes toward three different systems of advising in three separate undergraduate schools at the University of Pittsburgh. A secondary research question asked if students twenty-five years of age and older differed in their attitudes toward the advising systems. Questions dealt with accurate information, meeting student short-range program needs, facilitation of individual student development, and help in planning long-range goals. His findings showed that in all three schools students did not believe that advisors were performing

adequately in all of the areas. Students over twenty-five years of age had the same perceptions as their younger colleagues.

In a study of advising at four private liberal arts schools in Minnesota Brownlee (1977) found through an open-ended question that freshmen wanted to have a feeling of belonging to the institution through advisor contact, wanted to be assigned to an advisor in their own academic field, wanted the advisor to be accessible, and were concerned about their advisor's lack of knowledge about the institution.

Witters and Miller (1971), as part of a study at a major midwestern university, asked students and faculty about their expectations of academic advising. They found that students' views were limited. Seventy percent of the respondents thought that advisors should provide assistance in the areas of registration, career planning and graduate school information. Fifty percent did not expect assistance on personal or social problems. Students did want the freedom to plan their own programs and they expected their advisors to be well organized, competent, have a good sense of humor and be easy to get along with. They also wanted advisors to maintain regular office hours and be encouraging about degree completion. Faculty members wanted to change the impersonal advising atmosphere in their institution and to find ways to strengthen the advisor-advisee relationship. They identified the same expectations of advisors as did the students; however, they indicated that they had trouble keeping up with current policies and regulations.

Schwarz (1972) was interested in determining if students and faculty advisors held similar expectations concerning their interpersonal relationship and in finding out whether or not students experienced the type of relationship they had expected. Based on responses to the Relationship

Inventory (RI), which tests Carl Rogers' theory of therapist response in terms of congruence, empathy, level of regard and unconditionality of regard, he found that student and faculty expectations of the interpersonal relationship were similar. However, the student's actual advising experience was not equal to his/her expectations.

At the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Brady (1978) reported on advising goals of selected faculty advisors, expressed needs of undergraduates for advising and the congruence of the two. Faculty goals were to achieve good communication with advisees, have appropriate referral sources, help students set goals, maintain a general advising level rather than addressing specific problems, have adequate physical facilities and have sufficient time to advise. They did not wish to provide vocational counseling and placed boundaries on personal advising relationships.

Faculty were more concerned with the style or process aspects of advising than they were with providing information or emphasizing content issues. Students, however, wanted specific and accurate information in achieving their own goals but not in setting them, wanted access to resources and referrals, and hoped for a direct, informal, open-minded relationship with the advisor. They were not particularly interested in personal relationships with advisors but did want support in handling problems in the university system. As a result of her survey Brady found that student and faculty needs were incongruent in seventy-five percent of the categories listed. She suggested that advisors were more interested in dealing with the cognitive rather than the affective domain of the student and that female advisees might need more structure in advising as they moved into unfamiliar fields.

Some of these studies dealing with student expectations of academic

advising included students who were twenty-five years of age and older in their populations. Those studies reported that adult student expectations were the same as their younger counterparts. However, the literature shows that adults have some special concerns as they return to school. The next section of the literature review deals with concerns that adult students and advisors report.

ADULT STUDENT CONCERNS

Writers in adult education and counseling and guidance list four major concerns of adults who are returning to school. They are: lack of confidence (Am I too old? I might fail.), time constraints, financing school and inadequate study skills. Brown, (Farmer 1971); Fisher (1978); and Bulpitt (1973) all cited lack of self-confidence as a major barrier to adult students. Bulpitt and Fisher wrote that adults are often concerned about their ability to attain academic success or to keep up with younger students. They underestimate their ability and are often apologetic about having to ask questions to which they feel they should know the answers. They may be concerned that they are too old to learn. Griswold (1971) suggested that their own physical changes may be cause for concern too. Another concern, fear of failure was also listed by Harris and Kuckuck (1975); Fisher (1978); and Smydra and Kochenour (1979).

Time constraints and finances were listed as the major concerns, or barriers, by Heffernan (1977); Thompson and Jensen (1977); and Smydra and Kochenour (1979). Adults are worried about fitting classes into their schedules and about finding time to study. They are also concerned about financing and/or budgeting money for education.

Smydra and Kochenour (1979), Fisher (1978), Brown (1971) and Wells (1976)

agree too that inadequate study skills are an additional problem for older students. Their earlier educational background may have been deficient and many are aware that they need some remedial help. These writers noted that adults may have limited definitions or unrealistic expectations of education and themselves as well.

Six other concerns were cited by a number of writers in the field. Geographical and transportation barriers were listed by Thompson and Jensen (1977), Wells (1976), Smydra and Kochenour (1979), and Robinson (1980). Child care, mostly listed by women, was another concern according to Thompson and Jensen (1977), Smallwood (1980), and Robinson (1980). Women were worried about future employment (Plotsky, 1977; Chitayat and Hymer, 1977), but men did not want to get caught in a deadend career. Lourie (1979) and Robinson (1980) suggested that admissions and enrollment problems and credit for prior learning were often educational barriers. Finally, emotional support from home was an important concern to many adult students according to Plotsky (1977) and Chitayat and Hymer (1977).

If these concerns are real, what kinds of student services should colleges and universities provide for adult students? The final section of the literature review reports on studies in this area.

STUDENT SERVICES

In order to meet the needs of adult students, some adjustments in present advising services may have to be made and additional service may be required. In some institutions advising and personal counseling hours need to be changed to include evenings or Saturdays (Kasworm, 1979). Hengesbach (1979) reported studies in which approximately one-fourth of the adult students wanted meetings and counseling available to them at night. Kasworm

also suggested that special university orientation programs should be available to adult students and that these programs should address specific concerns such as age and time management. McCannon (1976) reported on an orientation program for adult evening students at Drake University which focuses on the mechanics of the University and also on adult self-development. Part of this program includes a game (BALANCE) especially designed for the orientation in which students learn how to register, deal with the bureaucracy, celebrate achievements and have a counselor help them with their problems.

Career counseling has also been cited by adult students as a needed service according to Hengesbach (1979), Smallwood (1980), and Harris and Kuckuck (1975). Older students face special difficulties in defining career goals and making a job selection, often due to lack of prior employment (women) or a shift in careers. They may need help in thinking through new goals and identifying skills, values and interests. Numerous programs at the college level have been reported. Bromfield and Kilmurray (1976) described a typical career and life planning course which includes personal assessment, goal setting, taking stock of one's life, sources of information and career strategies.

Financial aids assistance is required by many adult students according to Somogyi and Draheim (1978) and Kasworm (1979). Study skills workshops have been offered on a number of campuses according to Garfield and McHugh (1978), and Buckey, Freeark and O'Barr (1976) wrote about a special tutorial offering for adult students at Duke University. While study skills are the focus of the tutorial, dealing with college life as adult students and support for one another are also goals of the program.

Some schools have developed specific social programs for adult students. These students have special times to eat meals together, sponsor speakers

and provide support for one another. An especially outstanding program, Students Older Than Average (SOTA), has operated through the Student Union at the University of Texas at Austin (Plotsky, 1977). Events include happy hours on Fridays and Sandwich Seminars.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, selected literature on academic advising has been reviewed in order to provide a theoretical base for a study design of adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising. Seven areas were reviewed: terms commonly used in academic advising, models of advising, advising delivery systems, the advising process, student and faculty expectations of advising, adult student concerns and student services for adults. Much of the literature addresses processes and programs applicable to the traditional eighteen to twenty-two year old student; however, it is necessary to build on these materials in order to develop a framework for advising programs that will be useful for the older student population.

Chapter 3

THE DESIGN AND DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the purpose and methodology of the author's study on adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising. The problem will be reviewed, hypotheses and questions will be stated, and the population and the institution where the study took place will be described. The research tool and methods of implementation and analysis will be presented and limitations of the study will be stated.

THE PROBLEM

Gibson (1974) and Grites (1979, p. 54) reminded us that research in academic advising is still primitive. Grites wrote that this difficulty stems from the complexity of the advising process; as a result, most research has tended to be results or outcome-oriented. Little research has been reported concerning adult student expectations of academic advising and corresponding faculty expectations of the same process. As college and university adult student populations increase, it seems important, particularly for those administering advising programs or personnel engaging in advising, to learn more about adults and their advising needs and faculty perceptions of these needs and concerns. Therefore, the author has chosen to research and report on populations at one institution.

HYPOTHESES AND QUESTIONS

This study was undertaken in conjunction with the Advising Office at Metropolitan State University in order to look more closely at student and faculty expectations of academic advising. In order to do this, four areas were defined for the study and questionnaire design: contact between advisor and advisee, information and developmental aspects of the advising process that might be important to students and faculty, concerns adult students might have as they return to, or begin, their Metropolitan State University programs, and additional Advising Office services desired by adult students at the institution. Two null hypotheses were formulated.

Hypotheses

- (1) There are no differences between adult student and faculty expectations of important aspects of academic advising.
- (2) There are no differences between student and faculty perceptions of adult student concerns.

Two research questions were also investigated.

Questions

- (1) Are student and faculty expectations of advisor/advisee contact the same?
- (2) What additional Advising Office services would be used by adult students if they were offered?

Two related questions were studied as well and are described in this study.

Related Questions

- (1) Are there any differences in responses on contact, academic advising factors, or concerns with respect to students' sex or age?

- (2) Are there any differences in responses on contact, academic advising factors, or concerns on the basis of the faculty members' sex or number of years served as an academic advisor?

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTION AND THE POPULATION

Metropolitan State University

Metropolitan State University, an upper-division, accredited, nontraditional competence-based institution, first opened its doors to students in 1972. The University has no campus and utilizes community facilities for class instruction and learning opportunities such as internships and independent studies. There are twenty-three permanent faculty members at the university who teach, manage or develop specific programs and act as academic advisors. Approximately 350 adjunct faculty, referred to at the University as community faculty, teach the balance of Metropolitan State University courses and act as consultants or evaluators for students. Entering students are the equivalent of juniors or seniors in a traditional institution and the median age of degree candidates is thirty-five. Forty-six percent of the students enrolled in 1979-1980 were female; fifty-four percent were male (Metropolitan State University Self-Study Report, 1980, p. 31). The University was created to provide alternative educational opportunities for adults; thus, it seemed particularly appropriate to study its faculty and students in order to learn more about academic advising expectations.

The Advising Program

All incoming students at Metropolitan State University are required to take the Individualized Educational Planning course supervised by the

Advising Office. In this course students construct a degree plan designed to meet personal learning objectives. The course also provides students with an orientation to the University. Instructors act as advisors to the prospective students during this time. If the student's degree plan is accepted by the University, he/she becomes a degree candidate and a permanent faculty or staff member is assigned as an academic advisor. All faculty act as advisors. An average advising load for a faculty member is between sixty and seventy students.

The Advising Office provides other services to students as well. Students who have less than ninety credits may take the Planning and Assessment Workshop in order to develop learning strategies toward the required number of credits. The Advising Desk has been established to provide students with immediate telephone and walk-in advising service. Community faculty members have been trained to act as consultants in various fields of academic interest to students as the students construct, review and revise their degree plans. Students wishing to amend degree plans also work through the Advising Office and their advisors. Graduation planning and information about graduate schools is offered through the Advising Office. A used book exchange has also been established. A career/life planning center and classes operate under the direction of the Office as well. Personal counseling is available through some trained faculty and staff but most personal counseling is referred to a local community clinic. Study skills workshops and support groups have been offered with limited student response.

Populations

Students

For purposes of this study all incoming students enrolled in the

Individualized Educational Planning course who were age twenty-five and older, were surveyed during Spring quarter 1980. There were 193 original enrollees in the course. Nineteen students reported their age as less than twenty-five so that possible respondents numbered 174. One hundred twenty-four persons, or seventy-one percent, completed the questions; others had either dropped the class, were absent on the night the questionnaire was presented, or were unwilling to participate. No attempt was made to contact those who were not present.

Demographic questions provided information about sex and age of the new students participating in the survey. All of those participating answered the question about age. Sixty-two respondents, or fifty percent, were female and fifty percent were male. Almost one-third of the students were between thirty and thirty-four years of age. Figure 1 lists the number and percentage of student respondents in the nine age categories listed in the questionnaire.

FIGURE 1
AGE OF STUDENT RESPONDENTS

<u>Age</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
65 and over	1	.8%
60-64	2	1.6
55-59	2	1.6
50-54	8	6.4
45-49	11	8.9
40-44	14	11.3
35-39	19	15.3
30-34	40	32.3
25-29	27	21.8

Faculty

There are twenty-three permanent faculty members at Metropolitan State University. All of them responded to the questionnaire; however, one

respondent did not answer the question concerning sex and one did not respond to the question on number of years served as a faculty advisor. Of those responding twelve were female and ten were male. Most of the faculty members have acted as academic advisors for periods ranging from six to nine years. Figure 2 illustrates the number of years faculty members have served as academic advisors at Metropolitan State University and other institutions.

FIGURE 2
FACULTY ACADEMIC ADVISING EXPERIENCE

<u>Years Served</u>	<u>%</u>
10 or more	17.4%
6-9	47.8
3-5	17.4
0-2	13.0

FORMULATION OF THE RESEARCH TOOL

Original questionnaires were designed for both faculty and students in order to provide basic descriptive data about student and faculty expectations of academic advising at Metropolitan State University. Information was also sought on adult student concerns and additional services desired by the new students. Each of the questionnaires contained the same questions except that age and desired student services were not asked of faculty, and faculty, only, were asked to respond to the question concerning how many years each had served as an academic advisor.

Items for the questionnaire came from a review of academic advising, adult education and counseling literature, from discussions with persons concerned with academic advising, particularly administrators and staff at Metropolitan State University and, more specifically, from conclusions

drawn by Kramer and Gardner (1977), Crockett (1978b), Potter (1979) and the University of Michigan Poll (Morris, 1973a) previously cited. As a result of this information and through consultation with advising personnel at Metropolitan State University, the four questionnaire categories were determined: contact, important aspects of the advising process, adult student concerns and additional Advising Office services. Questionnaires and cover letters for both students and faculty are included in the Appendix as items A and B.

Contact

In the questionnaires, new students and faculty were asked how often they thought they would like to meet during the student's first year. Each person was asked if the advisee should be contacted by telephone or letter on a regular basis, and if the response was yes, each was asked how often.

Advising Factors

Fifteen factors were identified as important aspects of the academic advising process and students and faculty were asked to respond on a five point Likert Scale as to the degree of importance of each item to them. Figure 3 represents the Likert Scale used.

FIGURE 3
LIKERT SCALE FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>Not</u> <u>Important</u>				<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	

Advising factors listed in the questionnaire in random order were:

- (1) Contact if the student is inactive.
- (2) Awareness of student progress on the degree plan.
- (3) Put educational decision-making into the advisee's hands.
- (4) Awareness of other factors in the advisee's life such as family and job.
- (5) Provision of career information.
- (6) Information about graduate programs.
- (7) Advocacy for advisees.
- (8) Clarification of university policies and procedures.
- (9) Personal and caring relationship.
- (10) Understanding of the relationship between a student's career goals and liberal learning.
- (11) Information about learning resources or opportunities such as internships.
- (12) Development of self-awareness.
- (13) Availability of the advisor.
- (14) Assignment to an advisee because of similar work or educational background.
- (5) Help with specific course scheduling.

An open-ended item completed the list so that students and faculty could respond with additional factors that were important to them in the advising process.

Concerns

The same Likert Scale illustrated in Figure 3 was used by students and faculty in responding to the questions listing concerns adults might have as they returned to school. Eleven concerns were identified through the literature and an open-ended final response item was added. Concerns listed were:

- (1) Being too old to go back to school.
- (2) Opposition from family members.
- (3) Isolation from family and friends.
- (4) Keeping up with younger students.
- (5) Learning how to study.
- (6) Financing school.
- (7) Trying to fit school into the adult's schedule.
- (8) Poor reading, writing or math skills.
- (9) Fear of failure.
- (10) Competition from other students.
- (11) Concern about being away from the family in the evenings.

Student Services

Students also responded to a question asking what additional advising

services they would use if these services were offered. They could check as many services as they thought they would use. Proposed services were: student support groups, a student meeting room, vocational testing, Saturday and evening advising hours, tutoring, peer advising, job placement service, remediation workshops and counseling for personal problems. An open-ended response item was also included.

DATA COLLECTION

Students

During the 1980 Spring quarter the author took the student questionnaires to all fourteen of the Individualized Educational Planning classes. A cover letter attached to the questionnaire stated the purpose of the study and specified the age limit of twenty-five years for the respondents. The letter also stated that responses would be anonymous, would be used for aggregate analysis only, and that participation would be voluntary. The writer was available in the classroom to answer any questions students might have. Those who wished to participate filled out the questionnaires in class and the forms were immediately collected.

Faculty

During a 1980 Spring quarter faculty meeting the questionnaire and cover letter was distributed to all faculty who were present. Those not present at the meeting were sent questionnaires through the inter-office mail or, if they were on leave, sent to their homes. A reminder went out one week later to all of the non-respondents and a follow-up memorandum was sent two weeks later. All of the questionnaires were completed and returned.

DATA ANALYSIS

After the questionnaires for both students and faculty were completed the author transcribed instructions and responses onto code sheets. The data were then keypunched on cards, verified and processed at the Computer Center at the University of Minnesota. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Since the assumption was that a Likert Scale represented continuous interval data, SPSS instructions were to report demographic information, count cases, report frequencies and complete the standard statistics of mean, median, mode and standard deviation in the categories of advisor/advisee contact, important aspects of academic advising and student concerns. Student and faculty populations were compared on each item for significant differences in academic advising and student concerns. The two-tailed t-test at the $p < .01$ level was used. A comparison of percentage responses between faculty and students on the contact questions was completed. A count of cases was made to determine responses for additional student services.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The source of the data for this study was faculty and students at Metropolitan State University during Spring quarter 1980. The results are not necessarily typical of faculty and adult students at other colleges and universities. In addition, it is important to note that the student and faculty populations--particularly the faculty--are not large. Therefore, comparisons should be made cautiously. This study reported only on new Metropolitan State University students; if students who had been enrolled over a period of time were surveyed, results might be different. Another limitation is the types of questions asked. No negative items were included

and students and faculty tended to rate items, particularly in the advising factors category, toward the high end of the scale. In addition, because of the small size of faculty population, even if the scale were condensed, there were often fewer than five responses in some of the cells. Thus, it was not possible to draw comparisons between students and faculty with other tests such as the Chi-Square.

SUMMARY

The present chapter has explained the methods and procedures which the researcher used in conducting this study. The problem to be researched was adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising at Metropolitan State University. Through the literature and discussion with those involved in the advising program and process, four categories for a questionnaire were determined: contact between advisor and advisee, important aspects of the academic advising process, concerns of returning adult students, and needed student services. A questionnaire was designed and administered to all permanent faculty members and to new Metropolitan State University students during Spring quarter 1980. The data was analyzed by means of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) in order to provide basic descriptive information about adult student and faculty expectations of advising and to compare the expectations of the two groups. In Chapter 4 the results of the study are presented. They are reported in an organizational framework which follows the research hypotheses and questions stated in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to provide basic descriptive information about adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising at Metropolitan State University and to compare the responses of the two groups. This chapter presents the results of the study through a review of the findings for the two major hypotheses, the two questions and the two related research questions. Statistical data are presented in order to determine whether or not student and faculty expectations of academic advising are congruent and to illustrate the degree of importance of specific aspects of academic advising and adult student concerns as perceived by both faculty and students.

HYPOTHESES AND QUESTIONS

Two null hypotheses, two questions and two related research questions were formulated for this study.

Hypotheses

- (1) There are no differences between adult student and faculty expectations of important aspects of academic advising.
- (2) There are no differences between student and faculty perceptions of adult student concerns.

Questions

- (1) Are student and faculty expectations of advisor/advisee contact the same?
- (2) What additional Advising Office services would be used by students if they were offered?

Related Research Questions

- (1) Are there any differences in responses on contact, academic advising factors or concerns with respect to students' sex or age?
- (2) Are there any differences in responses on contact, academic advising factors, or concerns on the basis of the faculty members' sex or number of years served as an academic advisor?

RESULTS

Important Aspects of Academic Advising

Fifteen aspects of the academic advising process identified through the literature were listed on the questionnaire and students and faculty, using the five point Likert Scale, were asked to indicate the degree of importance to them of each item. An open-ended item at the end of the series provided opportunity for additional responses

Statistical analysis revealed the number of cases for each population in each cell on the Likert Scale, frequency in each cell, mean and standard deviation for each item. The t-test was used to compare faculty and student responses at the $p < .01$ level for significant difference. Table 1 lists all of the faculty responses to the fifteen aspects of academic advising, and

TABLE 1
FACULTY RESPONSES TO
IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

<u>Questions</u>	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Very Important</u> <u>5</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean Rank</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Contact If Inactive	---	13.0%	8.7%	39.1%	39.1%	4.043	5	1.022
Aware of Degree Plan Progress	---	4.3	30.4	39.1	26.1	3.087	7	.869
Student Educational Decision-Making	---	4.3	34.8	34.8	26.1	3.826	8	.887
Other Factors in Adult Student's Life	---	---	47.8	26.1	21.7	3.727	9	.827
Career Information	8.7	8.7	26.1	39.1	17.4	3.478	11	1.163
Graduate School Information	---	8.7	34.8	26.1	26.1	3.727	9	.985
Advocate for Advisee	---	---	4.3	30.4	65.2	4.609	2	.583
Clarify University Policies and Procedures	---	4.3	4.3	8.7	82.6	4.696	1	.765
Relate in Personal Way	---	---	21.7	30.4	47.8	4.261	4	.810
Relationship/Liberal Learning and Career Goals	4.3	---	---	30.4	65.2	4.522	3	.898
Inform/Other Learning Opportunities	---	8.7	17.4	34.8	39.1	4.043	5	.976
Development/Self-Awareness (2 missing cases)	17.4	17.4	17.4	17.4	21.7	3.095	12	1.480
Accessibility	4.3	8.7	13.0	30.4	43.5	4.000	6	1.168
Similar Educational or Work Background	4.3	17.4	17.4	26.1	34.8	3.696	10	1.259
Help With Course Scheduling	8.7	26.1	30.4	21.7	13.0	3.043	13	1.186

Table 2 lists student responses to each item. Based on the means, student responses were generally not as high on the scale as faculty responses. There were seven faculty means in the 4.00-4.99 section on the scale, and only four student means in the 4.00-4.99 section. However, there was no mean ranking in either population below 3.00, an indication that the factors listed were apparently of reasonable importance to both groups. Table 1 ranks faculty responses by mean to the questions on important aspects of advising. Faculty listed these aspects, in descending rank order down to 4.00 on the scale.

- (1) Clarify university policies and procedures.
- (2) Advocate for the advisee.
- (3) Help the advisee understand the relationship between liberal learning and his/her career goals or work.
- (4) Relate to the advisee in a personal way.
- (5) (Tied) Contact if inactive.
Inform advisee of other learning opportunities.
- (6) Inform the advisee of times when available for calls or meeting.

Table 2 lists all of the student responses by mean to the fifteen aspects of academic advising. Students listed only four factors at the 4.00 level or above. Only one (Make learning opportunities known to me) was the same as those listed in this interval by the faculty. Student rankings to the 4.00 level in descending order were:

- (1) Be aware of my progress on my degree plan.
- (2) Make learning opportunities known to me.
- (3) Provide career information.
- (4) Be assigned to me because of similar education or work background.

TABLE 2
STUDENT RESPONSES TO
IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

<u>Questions</u>	<u>Not Important 1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Very Important 5</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean Rank</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Contact If Inactive	8.1%	14.5%	34.7%	21.8%	21.0%	3.331	15	1.194
Aware of Degree Plan Progress	.8	1.6	17.7	34.7	42.7	4.198	1	.853
Student Educational Decision-Making	.8	4.0	22.6	40.3	31.5	3.984	5	.887
Other Factors in Adult Student's Life	10.5	7.3	27.4	29.8	23.4	3.492	13	1.235
Career Information	3.2	7.3	12.1	29.8	47.6	4.113	3	1.084
Graduate School Information	4.8	11.3	22.6	29.8	31.5	3.718	9	1.166
Advocate for Advisee	.8	4.8	26.6	37.9	29.8	3.911	7	.911
Clarify University Policies and Procedures	1.6	1.6	25.8	42.7	27.4	3.935	6	.866
Relate in Personal Way	3.2	6.5	32.3	33.1	23.4	3.680	11	1.014
Relationship/Liberal Learning and Career Goals	2.4	8.9	33.1	35.5	19.4	3.610	12	.980
Inform/Other Learning Opportunities	.8	3.2	17.1	34.7	41.1	4.149	2	.891
Development/Self-Awareness	3.2	21.0	26.6	31.5	16.9	3.382	14	1.098
Accessibility	1.6	6.5	30.6	31.5	29.0	3.805	9	.989
Similar Educational or Work Background	3.2	4.8	13.7	40.3	37.9	4.048	4	1.003
Help With Course Scheduling	2.4	8.9	30.6	33.1	24.2	3.683	10	1.019

T-tests showed significant differences at the $p. < .01$ level between faculty and students on five of the fifteen advising aspects listed. Faculty ranked all but one aspect (course scheduling) higher than did students. T-test results are reported in Table 3. Those items showing significant differences were:

- (1) Contact if inactive.
- (2) Advocacy for the advisee.
- (3) Clarify university policies and procedures.
- (4) Help the advisee understand the relationship between his/her career goals, or work, and liberal learning.
- (5) Help with specific course scheduling.

Because of these responses, the null hypothesis, there are no differences between adult student and faculty members' expectations of academic advising, was rejected for the five items and accepted for the remaining ten items.

Some faculty and students responded to the open-ended question about other advising factors that might be important to them. Two students wrote about the importance of advisor accessibility. Familiarity with the institution, its policies and courses, was emphasized by three students. One of the respondents commented that the advisor should be familiar with the university's current structure and future trends and should "help in keeping my perspective valid". Advisor awareness of personal concerns was listed by two students. And finally, one student commented that the "...advisor should be of help when needed, but not expected to lead you by the hand".

Faculty responses to the open-ended item varied. One faculty member wrote about contacting students, indicating that, while he knew this was a "should", other competing demands for faculty time and effort had to be taken into account. Two faculty members indicated that such issues as career and

TABLE 3

T-TEST COMPARISONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
ADULT STUDENTS AND FACULTY ON IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF
ACADEMIC ADVISING

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>Two-Tailed Probability</u>
	<u>Students</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	
Inactive	3.3306	4.0435	.008
Progress	4.1983	3.8696	.093
Decision-Making	3.9837	3.8261	.435
Life	3.4918	3.7273	.392
Career Information	4.1129	3.4783	.012
Graduate School	3.7177	3.7273	.971
Advocacy	3.9113	4.6087	.001
Policies	3.9350	4.6957	.000
Relate	3.6803	4.2609	.011
Liberal Learning	3.6098	4.5217	.000
Learning Opportunities	4.1488	4.0435	.610
Self-Awareness	3.3821	3.0952	.296
Accessibility	3.8049	4.0000	.400
Similar Background	4.0484	3.6957	.140
Schedule	3.6829	3.0435	.008

graduate school information, additional learning opportunities, and student development should be referred to more appropriate or designated personnel. Another faculty member commented on the self-awareness item, saying, "I don't know how to do this". Another respondent wrote that it was most important to hold the advisee responsible for maintaining the integrity of his/her degree plan. Networking students with other students and experts in the advisee's vocational or other interest areas was an important factor to one advisor. Finally, one respondent commented

"Be supportive and positive about the student's life and goals. My advisees often call to hear a positive affirming attitude, but this cannot be a forced attitude--you must truly believe that adults are good, capable, intelligent people who can achieve excellence".

Adult Student Concerns

Using the five point Likert Scale, students and faculty responded by degree of importance to them to concerns adults might have as they returned to school. Eleven items, identified through the literature, were listed.

Statistical analysis was completed in order to determine the number of respondents for each item and frequencies in each cell and mean and standard deviation were determined. The t-test was used to compare significant differences between faculty and student responses at the $p < .01$ level. Tables 4 and 5 list faculty and student responses to this question.

An analysis of faculty and student responses to adult student concerns shows greater differences than in the comparison of academic advising aspects. Faculty perceived adult student concerns at a much higher level on the scale than did students. In Table 5, student means show all of the items except two below the 3.00 level on the scale, an indication that most of the items were not important concerns to them. The two most important concerns they listed were trying to fit school into their schedule and

TABLE 4

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF ADULT STUDENT CONCERNS

<u>Items</u>	<u>Not Important 1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Very Important 5</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean Rank</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Too Old	---	13.0%	34.8%	26.1%	21.7%	3.591	6	1.008
Opposition From Family	4.3	30.4	26.1	26.1	8.7	3.045	8	1.090
Isolation (4 cases missing)	10.5	52.6	15.8	17.4	---	2.474	11	.964
Keeping Up With Younger Students (2 cases missing)	8.7	34.8	17.4	21.4	8.7	2.857	10	1.195
Learning How to Study	4.3	13.0	39.1	39.1	4.3	4.182	2	.853
Financing School	---	13.0	21.7	39.1	21.7	3.727	5	.985
Scheduling School	---	---	4.3	39.1	52.2	4.500	1	.598
Poor Reading, Writing, Math Skills (2 cases missing)	---	4.3	21.7	26.1	39.1	4.095	4	.944
Fear of Failure (3 cases missing)	---	---	21.7	30.4	34.8	4.150	3	.813
Competition from Other Students (4 cases missing)	5.3	21.1	42.1	31.6	---	3.000	9	.882
Concern About Being Away From Family/Evenings	---	4.3	65.2	21.7	4.3	3.273	7	.631

TABLE 5

ADULT STUDENT CONCERNS

<u>Items</u>	Not Important <u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	Very Important <u>5</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean Rank</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Too Old	66.9%	10.5%	12.9%	4.8%	3.2%	1.648	11	1.090
Opposition From Family	60.5	16.1	12.9	7.3	.8	1.686	10	1.017
Isolation	47.6	19.4	11.3	14.3	5.6	2.098	8	1.307
Keeping Up With Younger Students	54.8	15.3	13.7	9.7	3.2	1.875	9	1.185
Learning How to Study	23.4	8.1	24.2	29.8	12.1	2.992	3	1.363
Financing School	17.7	12.1	22.6	20.2	26.6	3.260	2	1.436
Scheduling School	1.6	3.2	17.7	31.5	44.4	4.156	1	.945
Poor Reading, Writing, Math Skills	29.0	16.1	27.4	16.9	8.9	2.598	5	1.315
Fear of Failure	33.1	14.5	22.6	14.5	12.9	2.587	6	1.424
Competition From Other Students	38.7	21.0	29.0	6.5	3.2	2.131	7	1.113
Concern About Being Away From Family/Evenings	33.1	7.3	24.2	20.2	12.1	2.700	4	1.441

financing their education. Table 4 shows that faculty listed all but two of the concern items above the 3.00 interval on the scale and four items above the 4.00 level. In descending rank order by mean, the four highest items were:

- (1) Scheduling school.
- (2) Learning how to study.
- (3) Fear of failure.
- (4) Poor reading, writing, math skills.

The t-test showed significant differences at the $p. < .01$ level in seven of the eleven items. Table 6 gives the t-test comparison between the two groups. Faculty and students differed on these items.

- (1) Fear of being too old to go back to school.
- (2) Family opposition.
- (3) Keeping up with younger students.
- (4) Learning how to study.
- (5) Poor reading, writing, math skills.
- (6) Fear of failure.
- (7) Competition from other students.

Faculty and students agreed that isolation and being away from one's family in the evening were not important concerns and also agreed that financing school and trying to fit school into the schedule were more important. Therefore, the null hypothesis, there are no differences between adult student and faculty members' perceptions of concerns of adult students, is rejected for seven items and accepted for the remaining four items.

Students and faculty were asked to respond to an open-ended item at the end of the adult student concerns list. Four students, responding to this question, cited time constraints. They were concerned about sacrificing

TABLE 6

T-TEST COMPARISONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
ADULT STUDENTS AND FACULTY ON ADULT STUDENT CONCERNS

<u>Items</u>	<u>Mean Measurement</u>		<u>Two-Tailed Probability</u>
	<u>Students</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	
Too Old	1.6475	3.5909	.000
Opposition From Family	1.6860	3.0455	.000
Isolation	2.0984	2.4737	.232
Keeping Up With Younger Students	1.8750	2.8571	.001
Learning How To Study	2.9917	4.1818	.000
Financing School	3.2602	3.7273	.146
Scheduling School	4.1557	4.5000	.102
Poor Reading, Writing, Math Skills	2.5984	4.0952	.000
Fear of Failure	2.5868	4.1500	.000
Competition From Other Students	2.1311	3.000	.001
Concern About Being Away From Family/Evenings	2.7000	3.2727	.070

leisure time for school and not having enough time for outside activities, school, family and home. One student was concerned about the time it would take to earn the degree. Two students worried that skills and concentration might be rusty. One student was concerned about a disability and another (in the thirty-five to thirty-nine age category) was concerned about becoming physically tired. Two students were concerned about performance in the classroom and one male student was worried about classes at night. (He hoped that more classes could be offered during the day hours). One student wrote that he was concerned about preparing for a career and one woman said that her concern was building her own self-image. Another woman may have given an explanation for the low student ratings on adult concerns when she commented that she had dealt with many of the concerns listed in the questionnaire and had resolved these issues before she entered the University.

Two faculty members responded to the open-ended item on adult student concerns. One advisor thought that students were unsure about Metropolitan State University policies and procedures and that some students were uncertain about career directions as well. Another commented that some adult students have self-doubts and would need feedback about their performance on a regular basis.

Contact

New adult students and faculty responded to three questions concerning advisor/advisee contacts. They were asked how often meetings should take place between the advisor and advisee during a student's first four quarters at Metropolitan State University, if advisees should be contacted by telephone or letter on a regular basis, and if the response was affirmative, how often that contact should take place. Responses by percent are listed in

Table 7. Comparisons were drawn by studying the percentage reported in each of the possible responses to the questions. Results show the largest student responses at each end of the possible choices in the first question. Nearly sixty-one percent of the students felt that they would like to meet with their advisors once a quarter while only twenty-six percent of the faculty chose that option. However, twenty-three percent of the students said that they would like to meet only if they requested the meeting and twenty-six percent of the faculty agreed that meetings were necessary only on request. Faculty were more evenly divided than students in their choices for once a quarter, twice a year, once a year or by request only.

More faculty (82.6%) than students (68.5%) said that there should be telephone or letter contact on a regular basis. However, these responses seem to indicate that both groups agree that this is important communication. Over half the students responding affirmatively thought that such contacts should be made once a quarter; thirty percent of the faculty thought once a quarter was appropriate; and forty-three percent selected twice a year.

Based on these responses, the answer to the question, are student and faculty expectations of advisor/advisee contact the same, is that students differ from faculty in the number of contacts they would like to have but that they agree with faculty on the idea of regular telephone or letter contact.

Student Services

The final question in the Advising Survey asked students what additional Advising Office services they would use if they were offered. Students could check as many responses as they thought were appropriate to them. Nine possible services were listed and an open-ended response was added.

TABLE 7

STUDENT AND FACULTY RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONS ON ADVISOR/ADVISEE CONTACT

1. How often should meetings take place between the advisor/advisee during the new student's first four quarters?

	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>	<u>Request Only</u>
Faculty	26.1%	26.1%	17.4%	26.1%
Students	60.5	10.5	4.0	23.4

2. Should advisees be contacted by telephone or letter on a regular basis?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Faculty	82.6%	17.4%
Students	68.5	30.6

3. If Yes, how often?

	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>
Faculty	30.4%	43.5%	8.7%
Students	52.4	14.5	2.4

Table 8 lists advising services students would use if they were offered. Forty-four percent of the respondents said that they would use a job placement service and Saturday and evening advising hours if these were available; thirty-five percent would attend remediation workshops. Tutoring would be useful to thirty-three percent and twenty-nine percent asked for vocational testing.

Five students responded to the open-ended question in this category. One student emphasized the importance of personal counseling at Metropolitan State University and another asked that an Alcoholics Anonymous support group be started. A respondent thought that the Advising Office should provide information about other community resources and one asked that medical insurance be offered. A new student also suggested that recreational activities for students be organized.

Related Questions

Two related questions were also asked in this study. They were:

- (1) Are there any differences in responses on contact, academic advising factors or concerns with respect to students' sex or age?
- (2) Are there any differences in responses on contact, academic advising factors or concerns on the basis of the faculty members' sex or number of years served as an academic advisor?

Contact

Students

Table 9 gives a comparison of faculty and student responses, by sex, on contact questions in the instrument used in the study. More female students (67.7%) wanted to see their advisors once a quarter than

TABLE 8

STUDENT RESPONSES TO
ADVISING SERVICES THEY WOULD USE

<u>Services</u>	<u>n</u>
Student Support Groups-----	23
Student Meeting Room-----	14
Vocational Testing-----	36
Saturday and Evening Advising Hours-----	55
Tutoring-----	41
Student or Peer Advisors-----	20
Job Placement Service-----	55
Remediation (math, reading, writing skills) Workshops-----	43
Counseling for Personal Problems-----	14

TABLE 9

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY AND STUDENT
RESPONSES, BY SEX, ON CONTACT QUESTIONS

1. How often would you like to meet with an advisee during his/her first four quarters as a Metro U student?

	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>	<u>Request Only</u>
<u>Faculty</u>				
Males	10.0%	40.0%	20.0%	30.0%
Females	41.7	16.7	16.7	25.0
<u>Students</u>				
Males	55.0	10.0	3.3	31.7
Females	67.7	11.3	4.3	16.1

2. Do you think you should contact your advisees by telephone or letter on a regular basis?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Faculty</u>		
Males	80.0	20.0
Females	83.3	16.7
<u>Students</u>		
Males	67.7	32.3
Females	70.5	29.5

3. If Yes, how often?

	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>
<u>Faculty</u>			
Males	14.3	71.4	14.3
Females	45.5	45.5	9.1
<u>Students</u>			
Males	81.0	19.0	---
Females	70.5	22.7	6.8

did males (55%). More males (31.7%) were interested in meeting by request only than were females (16.1%). Students were in close agreement on the importance of regular telephone or letter contact and that it should be once a quarter. Table 10 lists students' responses to these questions by age. No significant differences were found in the contact questions on the basis of age; most students in each age category indicated that they wanted to see or hear from their advisor once a quarter.

Faculty

Table 9 shows that female faculty members (41.7%) thought that advisees should be seen once a quarter while only ten percent of the male faculty agreed. Most of them (40%) selected twice a year. However, a significant number--thirty percent males and twenty-five percent females--agreed that meetings by request only were more appropriate. No significant differences were shown on the question of regular phone or mail contact. Both groups thought it was important; however, female faculty members were evenly divided on contacting students once or twice a year while males (71.4%) preferred twice a year.

Table 11 gives a comparison of faculty responses to contact questions based on the number of years served as an academic advisor at Metropolitan State University and other colleges and universities. Responses on meeting times during the first year indicate that new advisors (0-2 years) and the more experienced advisors (10 or more years) think that they should meet with an advisee once a quarter while half of those who have three to five years' experience agree on meetings by request only. Regardless of advising experience, faculty

TABLE 10

A COMPARISON OF STUDENT RESPONSES, BY AGE,
TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING ADVISOR/ADVISEE CONTACTS

1. How often do you think you would like to meet with your advisor during your first year as a Metro U student?

<u>Age</u>	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>	<u>By Request</u>	<u>Cases</u>
25-29	55.6%	3.7%	7.4%	33.3%	27
30-34	55.0	20.0	2.5	22.5	40
35-39	66.7	11.1	5.6	16.7	18
40-44	50.0	14.3	7.1	28.6	14
45-49	90.0	---	---	10.0	10
50-54	87.5	---	---	12.5	8
55-59	50.0	---	---	50.0	2
60-64	50.0	---	---	50.0	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	1

2. Would you like your advisor to contact you by telephone or letter on a regular basis?

<u>Age</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Cases</u>
25-29	61.5%	38.5%	26
30-34	65.0	35.0	40
35-39	68.4	31.6	19
40-44	64.3	35.7	14
45-49	81.8	18.2	11
50-54	100.0	---	8
55-59	100.0	---	2
60-64	50.0	50.0	2
65 and over	100.0	---	1

3. If Yes, how often?

<u>Age</u>	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>	<u>Cases</u>
25-29	81.3%	12.5%	6.3%	16
30-34	61.5	38.5	---	26
35-39	76.9	15.4	7.7	13
40-44	80.0	20.0	---	10
45-49	88.9	---	11.1	9
50-54	87.5	12.5	---	8
55-59	100.0	---	---	2
60-64	100.0	---	---	1
65 and over	---	100.0	---	1

TABLE 11

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY RESPONSES,
BY YEARS SERVED AS ADVISORS, TO CONTACT QUESTIONS

1. How often would you like to meet with an advisee during his/her first four quarters as a Metro U student?

<u>Years Served</u>	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>	<u>By Request</u>
0-2 (3 cases)	66.7%	---	33.3%	---
3-5 (4 cases)	---	25.0	25.0	50.0
6-9 (11 cases)	18.2	36.4	18.2	27.3
10 or more (4 cases)	50.0	25.0	---	25.0

2. Do you think you should contact your advisees by telephone or letter, on a regular basis?

<u>Years Served</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
0-2	66.7%	33.3%
3-5	75.0	25.0
6-9	90.9	9.1
10 or more	75.0	25.0

3. If Yes, how often?

<u>Years Served</u>	<u>Once A Quarter</u>	<u>Twice A Year</u>	<u>Once A Year</u>
0-2 (2 cases)	---	50.0%	50.0%
3-5 (2 cases)	---	100.0	---
6-9 (11 cases)	36.4	54.5	9.1
10 or more (3 cases)	66.7	33.3	---

concur on the importance of regular contact by mail or telephone and most agree that these contacts should be twice a year.

Important Aspects of Academic Advising

Students

A comparison of male and female student responses on academic advising factors is given in Table 12. Responses were similar in most items; however, two items showed marked differences. More females rated career information as important (4.00-5.99) on the scale than did males. More males ranked clarifying university policies and procedures higher (4.00-5.99) than did females.

Table 13 shows student responses, by age categories, to important aspects of academic advising. No significant differences were observed on these items on the basis of age; however, it is important to note that the majority of respondents in each age group rated almost all of the advising aspects at 3.00 or higher on the interval scale. A larger number of students in all of the age categories in comparison to responses on other items indicated on the level of 2.00-2.99 that development of self-awareness was not particularly important to them.

Faculty

A comparison of male and female faculty responses to important aspects of academic advising is listed in Table 14. It shows that female faculty members ranked some aspects of advising higher than males did although both groups gave most items a 3.00 or higher rating on the interval scale. Eighty-three percent of the female faculty rated awareness of degree plan progress from 4.00-5.99 while only forty percent of the males did so. More females ranked relate in a personal

TABLE 12

A COMPARISON OF STUDENT RESPONSES, BY SEX,
ON IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5
Contact If Inactive					
Males	8.1%	9.7%	35.5%	24.2%	22.6%
Females	8.1	19.4	33.9	19.4	19.4
Aware of Degree Plan Progress					
Males	1.7	3.3	18.3	40.0	36.7
Females	---	---	18.0	31.1	50.8
Student Educational Decision-Making					
Males	1.6	4.9	23.0	34.4	36.1
Females	---	3.2	22.6	46.8	27.4
Other Factors in Adult Student's Life					
Males	8.1	11.3	29.0	24.2	27.4
Females	13.3	3.3	26.7	36.7	20.0
Career Information					
Males	4.8	9.7	21.0	29.0	35.5
Females	1.6	4.8	3.2	30.6	59.7
Graduate School Information					
Males	1.6	16.1	24.2	29.0	29.0
Females	8.1	6.5	21.0	30.6	33.9
Advocate for Advisee					
Males	---	4.8	25.8	41.9	27.4
Females	1.6	4.8	27.4	33.9	32.3
Clarify University Policies and Procedures					
Males	1.6	1.6	19.4	50.0	27.4
Females	1.6	1.6	32.8	36.1	27.9
Relate in Personal Way					
Males	3.2	4.8	35.5	30.6	25.9
Females	3.3	8.3	30.0	36.7	21.7
Relationship/Liberal Learning Career Goals					
Males	4.8	4.8	35.5	30.6	24.2
Females	---	13.1	31.1	41.0	14.8
Inform/Other Learning Opportunities					
Males	1.6	4.9	23.0	31.1	39.3
Females	---	1.7	13.3	40.0	45.0
Development/Self-Awareness					
Males	4.9	16.4	31.1	32.8	14.8
Females	1.6	25.8	22.6	30.6	19.4
Accessibility					
Males	---	6.6	34.3	32.8	26.2
Females	3.2	6.5	27.4	30.6	32.3
Similar Educational or Work Background					
Males	3.2	6.5	16.1	41.9	32.3
Females	3.2	3.2	11.3	38.7	43.5
Help With Course Scheduling					
Males	1.6	6.5	32.3	35.5	24.2
Females	3.3	11.5	29.5	31.1	24.6

TABLE 13
STUDENT RESPONSES, BY AGE,
TO IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

	Not Important				Very Important	Cases
	1	2	3	4	5	
Contact If Inactive						
25-29	11.1%	3.7%	40.7%	29.6%	14.8%	27
30-34	5.0	25.0	32.5	25.0	12.5	40
35-39	---	21.0	31.6	15.8	31.6	19
40-44	21.4	7.1	35.7	14.3	21.4	14
45-49	9.1	9.1	9.1	27.3	45.5	11
50-54	12.5	---	50.0	12.5	25.0	8
55-59	---	---	100.0	---	---	2
60-64	---	50.0	50.0	---	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	---	100.0	1
Aware of Degree Plan Progress						
25-29	3.8	---	19.2	46.2	30.8	26
30-34	---	2.6	20.5	28.2	48.7	39
35-39	---	5.3	10.5	42.1	42.1	19
40-44	---	---	28.6	35.7	35.7	14
45-49	---	---	18.2	18.2	63.6	11
50-54	---	---	---	28.6	71.4	7
55-59	---	---	---	100.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	---	100.0	1
Student Educational Decision-Making						
25-29	---	---	30.8	34.6	34.6	26
30-34	2.5	7.5	12.5	50.0	27.5	40
35-39	---	10.5	21.1	31.6	36.8	19
40-44	---	---	21.4	57.1	21.4	14
45-49	---	---	27.3	27.3	45.5	11
50-54	---	---	50.0	12.5	37.5	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	---	50.0	2
60-64	---	---	---	100.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	100.0	---	1
Other Factors in Adult Student's Life						
25-29	11.5	7.7	42.3	23.1	15.4	26
30-34	5.1	10.3	25.6	33.3	25.6	39
35-39	---	10.5	31.6	31.6	26.3	19
40-44	21.4	7.1	7.1	35.7	28.6	14
45-49	45.5	---	27.3	9.1	18.2	11
50-54	---	---	12.5	50.0	37.5	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	---	100.0	1
Career Information						
25-29	---	11.1	22.2	18.5	48.1	27
30-34	---	5.0	7.5	30.0	57.5	40
35-39	---	10.5	10.5	36.8	42.1	19
40-44	7.1	7.1	14.3	28.6	42.9	14
45-49	---	---	9.1	45.5	45.5	11
50-54	25.0	---	---	37.5	37.5	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
60-64	50.0	---	---	---	50.0	2
65 and over	---	100.0	---	---	---	1
Graduate School Information						
25-29	---	14.8	29.6	33.3	22.2	27
30-34	2.5	7.5	20.0	35.0	35.0	40
35-39	---	15.8	21.1	21.1	42.1	19
40-44	---	---	28.6	42.9	28.6	14
45-49	27.3	---	36.4	9.1	27.3	11
50-54	12.5	37.5	---	---	50.0	8
55-59	50.0	---	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	---	100.0	---	2
65 and over	---	100.0	---	---	---	1

TABLE 13 (continued)

	Not Important				Very Important	Cases
	1	2	3	4	5	
Advocate for Advisee						
25-29	---	7.4%	48.0%	22.2%	22.2%	27
30-34	---	2.5	35.0	40.0	22.5	40
35-39	---	5.3	5.3	52.6	36.8	19
40-44	---	7.1	14.3	35.7	42.9	14
45-49	9.1	9.1	---	45.5	36.4	11
50-54	---	---	25.0	12.5	62.5	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	---	100.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	100.0	---	1
Clarify University Policies and Procedures						
25-29	---	---	38.5	42.3	19.2	26
30-34	---	---	27.5	52.5	20.0	40
35-39	---	5.3	10.5	47.4	36.8	19
40-44	---	7.1	35.7	21.4	35.7	14
45-49	18.2	---	9.1	45.5	27.3	11
50-54	---	---	37.5	12.5	50.0	8
55-59	---	---	---	50.0	50.0	2
60-64	---	---	---	100.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	---	100.0	1
Relate in Personal Way						
25-29	3.8	11.5	26.9	38.5	19.2	26
30-34	---	5.0	32.5	40.0	22.5	40
35-39	---	10.5	36.8	21.1	31.6	19
40-44	---	---	35.7	28.6	28.6	14
45-49	18.2	9.1	36.4	18.2	18.2	11
50-54	---	---	14.3	42.9	42.9	7
55-59	---	---	100.0	---	---	2
60-64	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	100.0	---	1
Relationship/Liberal Learning and Career Goals						
25-29	3.8	---	42.3	46.2	7.7	26
30-34	---	12.5	35.0	32.5	20.0	40
35-39	---	10.5	42.1	15.8	31.6	19
40-44	7.1	14.3	21.4	50.0	7.1	14
45-49	---	9.1	18.2	54.5	18.2	11
50-54	12.5	---	25.0	12.5	50.0	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	50.0	---	50.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	---	100.0	1
Inform/Other Learning Opportunities						
25-29	---	---	15.4	38.5	46.2	26
30-34	---	2.6	15.8	42.1	39.5	38
35-39	---	---	21.1	26.3	52.6	19
40-44	7.1	7.1	21.4	35.7	28.6	14
45-49	---	---	18.2	36.4	45.5	11
50-54	---	---	12.5	25.0	62.5	8
55-59	---	50.0	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	100.0	---	---	2
65 and over	---	100.0	---	---	---	1
Development/Self-Awareness						
25-29	7.7	15.4	30.8	30.8	15.4	26
30-34	2.5	15.0	27.5	42.5	12.5	40
35-39	---	31.6	15.8	21.1	31.6	19
40-44	7.1	21.4	21.4	42.9	7.1	14
45-49	---	27.3	27.3	27.3	18.2	11
50-54	---	25.0	37.5	---	37.5	8
55-59	---	50.0	50.0	---	---	2
60-64	---	50.0	---	50.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	100.0	---	---	1

TABLE 13 (continued)

	Not Important				Very Important	Cases
	1	2	3	4	5	
Accessibility						
25-29	---	11.1%	44.4%	18.5%	25.9%	27
30-34	2.6	---	33.3	35.9	28.2	39
35-39	---	5.3	31.6	31.6	31.6	19
40-44	---	21.4	7.1	57.1	14.3	14
45-49	9.1	9.1	18.2	18.2	45.5	11
50-54	---	---	37.5	---	62.5	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	---	100.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	100.0	---	1
Similar Educational or Work Background						
25-29	3.7	7.4	18.5	48.1	22.2	27
30-34	2.5	2.5	7.5	32.5	55.0	40
35-39	---	5.3	5.3	42.1	47.4	19
40-44	---	14.3	7.1	50.0	28.6	14
45-49	9.1	---	18.2	45.5	27.3	11
50-54	12.5	---	37.5	25.0	25.0	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	---	50.0	50.0	2
65 and over	---	---	100.0	---	---	1
Help With Course Scheduling						
25-29	3.7	7.4	40.7	33.3	14.8	27
30-34	---	7.5	30.0	32.5	30.0	40
35-39	---	11.1	22.2	27.8	38.9	18
40-44	7.1	---	50.0	35.7	7.1	14
45-49	9.1	18.2	18.2	36.4	18.2	11
50-54	---	25.0	---	37.5	37.5	8
55-59	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	50.0	50.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	---	100.0	1

TABLE 14

FACULTY RESPONSES, BY SEX, TO
IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5
Contact If Inactive					
Males	---	10.0%	10.0%	40.0%	40.0%
Females	---	16.7	8.3	33.3	41.7
Aware of Degree Plan Progress					
Males	---	10.0	50.0	30.0	10.0
Females	---	---	16.7	41.7	41.7
Student Educational Decision-Making					
Males	---	---	40.0	40.0	20.0
Females	---	8.3	33.3	33.3	25.0
Other Factors in Adult Student's Life					
Males	---	---	60.0	10.0	30.0
Females	---	---	45.5	45.5	9.1
Career Information					
Males	20.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	30.0
Females	---	8.3	33.3	50.0	8.3
Graduate School Information					
Males	---	10.0	50.0	10.0	30.0
Females	---	9.1	27.3	36.4	27.3
Advocate for Advisee					
Males	---	---	10.0	20.0	70.0
Females	---	---	---	41.7	58.3
Clarify University Policies and Procedures					
Males	---	10.0	---	---	90.0
Females	---	---	8.3	16.7	75.0
Relate in Personal Way					
Males	---	---	40.0	20.0	40.0
Females	---	---	8.3	41.7	50.0
Relationship/Liberal Learning and Career Goals					
Males	---	---	---	40.0	60.0
Females	8.3	---	---	25.0	66.7
Inform/Other Learning Opportunities					
Males	---	10.0	30.0	20.0	40.0
Females	---	8.3	8.3	50.0	33.3
Development/Self-Awareness					
Males	33.3	33.3	11.1	11.1	11.1
Females	9.1	9.1	27.3	27.3	27.3
Accessibility					
Males	10.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	20.0
Females	---	8.3	8.3	16.7	66.7
Similar Educational or Work Background					
Males	10.0	10.0	---	30.0	50.0
Females	---	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Help With Course Scheduling					
Males	20.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	10.0
Females	---	25.0	33.3	25.0	16.7

way, development of self-awareness and accessibility at the 4.00-5.99 levels and females were more concerned about the importance of graduate school information, and making other learning opportunities known to students. Male faculty members (80%) rated similar work or educational background in the two highest categories on the scale while only fifty percent of the females gave it the same rating.

Table 15 presents a comparison of faculty responses by number of years served as an advisor to the questions on important aspects of academic advising. Here, new advisors (0-2 years) ranked most advising factors higher than did their more experienced colleagues including contact if inactive, be aware of degree plan progress, relate in a personal way and specific information such as careers or graduate school information, and other learning opportunities. However, they thought it was less important to put educational decision-making into the advisee's hands than did the other advisors. Development of self-awareness was listed as more important by new advisors; however, this item was not rated as highly by any of the groups as they rated most other items.

Adult Student Concerns

Students

Males and females were very evenly divided in their responses to items reporting concerns they might have as they return to school. This is illustrated in Table 16. Most of the student responses to these items were clustered toward the lower ends of the scales, from the 1.00 to 3.99 levels.

Table 17 presents a breakdown of adult student concerns by age

TABLE 15

FACULTY RESPONSES
BY YEARS SERVED AS ADVISORS,
ON IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5
Contact If Inactive					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	66.7	33.3
3-5	---	---	---	25.0	75.0
6-9	---	27.3	9.1	36.4	27.3
10 or more	---	---	25.0	25.0	50.0
Aware of Degree Plan Progress					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
3-5	---	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
6-9	---	---	57.1	44.4	50.0
10 or more	---	---	50.0	50.0	---
Student Educational Decision-Making					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	66.7	33.3	---
3-5	---	---	25.0	25.0	50.0
6-9	---	9.1	27.3	45.5	18.2
10 or more	---	---	50.0	25.0	25.0
Other Factors in the Adult Student's Life					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	66.7	33.3	---
3-5	---	---	66.7	---	33.3
6-9	---	---	45.5	36.4	18.2
10 or more	---	---	50.0	25.0	25.0
Career Information					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	66.7	33.3
3-5	25.0	---	25.0	25.0	25.0
6-9	9.1	18.2	27.3	36.4	9.1
10 or more	---	---	50.0	25.0	25.0
Graduate School Information					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	66.7	33.3
3-5	---	25.0	---	50.0	25.0
6-9	---	10.0	50.0	10.0	30.0
10 or more	---	---	75.0	---	25.0
Advocate for Advisee					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
3-5	---	---	---	---	100.0
6-9	---	---	---	54.5	45.5
10 or more	---	---	25.0	---	75.0
Clarify University Policies and Procedures					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
3-5	---	---	---	---	100.0
6-9	---	9.1	9.1	9.1	72.7
10 or more	---	---	---	---	100.0
Relate in Personal Way					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
3-5	---	---	50.0	---	50.0
6-9	---	---	18.2	45.5	36.4
10 or more	---	---	25.0	25.0	50.0
Relationship/Liberal Learning and Career Goals					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
3-5	---	---	---	25.0	75.0
6-9	9.1	---	---	36.4	54.5
10 or more	---	---	---	25.0	75.0

TABLE 15 (continued)

	Not Important				Very Important
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Inform/Other Learning Opportunities					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3%	66.7%
3-5	---	---	25.0	75.0	---
6-9	---	18.2	18.2	27.3	36.4
10 or more	---	---	25.0	25.0	50.0
Development/Self-Awareness					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	33.3	33.3	33.3
3-5	---	33.3	33.3	33.3	---
6-9	30.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0
10 or more	25.0	25.0	---	---	50.0
Accessibility					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
3-5	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	---
6-9	---	9.1	9.1	27.3	54.5
10 or more	---	---	25.0	25.0	50.0
Similar Educational or Work Background					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	33.3	66.7	---
3-5	---	25.0	---	50.0	25.0
6-9	9.1	27.3	---	9.1	54.5
10 or more	---	---	50.0	25.0	25.0
Help With Course Scheduling					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	33.3	33.3	33.3
3-5	25.0	50.0	25.0	---	---
6-9	9.1	36.4	9.1	27.3	18.2
10 or more	---	---	75.0	25.0	---

TABLE 16

A COMPARISON OF ADULT STUDENTS' CONCERNS, BY SEX

<u>Items</u>	Not Important				Very Important
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Too Old</u>					
Males	67.7%	12.9%	12.9%	4.8%	1.6%
Females	68.3	8.3	13.3	5.0	5.0
<u>Opposition From Family</u>					
Males	59.7	21.0	14.5	4.8	---
Females	64.4	11.9	11.9	10.2	1.7
<u>Isolation</u>					
Males	48.4	22.6	11.3	11.3	6.5
Females	48.3	16.7	11.7	18.3	5.0
<u>Keeping Up With Younger Students</u>					
Males	58.1	19.4	9.7	9.7	3.2
Females	55.2	12.1	19.0	10.3	3.4
<u>Learning How to Study</u>					
Males	23.3	6.7	28.3	31.7	10.0
Females	24.6	9.8	21.3	29.5	14.8
<u>Financing School</u>					
Males	21.0	14.5	21.0	24.2	19.4
Females	14.8	9.8	24.6	16.4	34.4
<u>Scheduling School</u>					
Males	3.3	3.3	19.7	36.1	37.7
Females	---	3.3	16.4	27.9	52.5
<u>Poor Reading, Writing, Math Skills</u>					
Males	30.6	14.5	29.0	19.4	6.5
Females	28.3	18.3	26.7	15.0	11.7
<u>Fear of Failure</u>					
Males	35.0	13.3	25.0	13.3	13.3
Females	32.8	16.4	21.3	16.4	13.1
<u>Competition From Other Students</u>					
Males	45.2	24.2	22.6	4.8	3.2
Females	33.3	18.3	36.7	8.3	3.3
<u>Concern About Being Away From Family/ Evenings</u>					
Males	36.1	8.2	24.6	21.3	9.8
Females	32.2	6.8	25.4	20.3	15.3

TABLE 17

A COMPARISON OF ADULT STUDENTS' CONCERNS, BY AGE

	Not Important				Very Important	
	1	2	3	4	5	Cases
Too Old						
25-29	68.0%	8.0%	16.0%	4.0%	4.0%	25
30-34	67.5	17.5	7.5	2.5	5.0	40
35-39	57.9	10.5	21.1	10.5	---	19
40-44	85.7	7.1	7.1	---	---	14
45-49	65.6	9.1	27.3	---	---	11
50-54	62.5	---	12.5	12.5	12.5	8
55-59	50.0	---	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	100.0	---	---	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Opposition From Family						
25-29	60.0	16.0	12.0	12.0	---	25
30-34	47.5	25.0	20.0	7.5	---	40
35-39	63.2	15.8	15.8	5.3	---	19
40-44	69.2	7.7	15.4	7.7	---	13
45-49	81.8	18.2	---	---	---	11
50-54	87.5	---	---	---	12.5	8
55-59	50.0	---	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	100.0	---	---	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Isolation						
25-29	32.0	24.0	20.0	16.0	8.0	25
30-34	45.0	32.5	5.0	15.0	2.5	40
35-39	47.4	15.8	15.8	21.1	---	19
40-44	42.9	7.1	14.3	21.4	14.3	14
45-49	72.7	9.1	18.2	---	---	11
50-54	75.0	---	---	---	25.0	8
55-59	50.0	---	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	100.0	---	---	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Keeping Up With Younger Students						
25-29	52.0	20.0	24.0	---	4.0	25
30-34	55.0	25.0	12.5	5.0	2.5	40
35-39	38.9	16.7	22.2	16.7	5.6	18
40-44	61.5	---	7.7	30.8	---	13
45-49	72.7	---	9.1	18.2	---	11
50-54	87.5	---	---	---	12.5	8
55-59	---	50.0	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	100.0	---	---	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Learning How To Study						
25-29	20.0	8.0	20.0	32.0	20.0	25
30-34	20.0	10.0	27.5	35.0	7.5	40
35-39	16.7	11.1	33.3	27.8	11.1	18
40-44	21.4	7.1	35.7	28.6	7.1	14
45-49	36.4	---	18.2	27.3	18.2	11
50-54	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	8
55-59	50.0	---	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	50.0	---	---	50.0	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Financing School						
25-29	19.2	7.7	23.1	26.9	23.1	26
30-34	15.0	15.0	15.0	22.5	32.5	40
35-39	10.5	26.3	21.1	10.5	31.6	19
40-44	14.3	14.3	50.0	---	21.4	14
45-49	36.4	---	27.3	27.3	9.1	11
50-54	12.5	---	12.5	25.0	50.0	8
55-59	50.0	---	50.0	---	---	2
60-64	50.0	---	---	50.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	100.0	---	1

TABLE 17 (continued)

	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Cases
Scheduling School						
25-29	---	---	23.1%	42.3%	34.6%	26
30-34	2.6	2.6	12.8	20.5	61.5	39
35-39	---	10.5	21.1	26.3	42.1	19
40-44	---	---	21.4	21.4	57.1	14
45-49	9.1	---	9.1	54.5	27.3	11
50-54	---	---	37.5	25.0	37.5	8
55-59	---	50.0	---	50.0	---	2
60-64	---	---	---	100.0	---	2
65 and over	---	---	---	100.0	---	1
Poor Reading, Writing, Math Skills						
25-29	34.6	7.7	30.8	15.4	11.5	26
30-34	25.0	22.5	25.0	17.5	10.0	40
35-39	15.8	10.5	47.4	26.3	---	19
40-44	28.6	21.4	28.6	21.4	---	14
45-49	45.5	9.1	9.1	9.1	27.3	11
50-54	57.1	14.3	---	14.3	14.3	7
55-59	---	50.0	50.0	---	---	2
60-64	---	50.0	50.0	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Fear of Failure						
25-29	30.8	11.5	34.6	7.7	15.4	26
30-34	28.2	23.1	23.1	15.4	10.3	39
35-39	22.2	5.6	22.2	27.8	22.2	18
40-44	28.6	21.4	14.3	21.4	14.3	14
45-49	45.5	9.1	18.2	18.2	9.1	11
50-54	62.5	---	25.0	---	12.5	8
55-59	100.0	---	---	---	---	2
60-64	50.0	50.0	---	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Competition From Other Students						
25-29	40.0	20.0	32.0	8.0	---	25
30-34	40.0	22.5	25.0	7.5	5.0	40
35-39	26.3	15.8	42.1	10.5	5.3	19
40-44	42.9	28.6	21.4	7.1	---	14
45-49	38.4	18.2	45.5	---	---	11
50-54	50.0	25.0	12.5	---	12.5	8
55-59	50.0	---	50.0	---	---	2
60-64	50.0	50.0	---	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1
Concern About Being Away From Family/Evenings						
25-29	29.2	8.3	29.2	25.0	8.3	24
30-34	35.0	5.0	12.5	27.5	20.0	40
35-39	10.5	10.5	42.1	26.3	10.5	19
40-44	28.6	7.1	35.7	14.3	14.3	14
45-49	54.5	---	27.3	9.1	9.1	11
50-54	71.4	---	28.6	---	---	7
55-59	100.0	---	---	---	---	2
60-64	---	100.0	---	---	---	2
65 and over	100.0	---	---	---	---	1

categories. There appear to be no significant differences in responses based on age. Most of the respondents in all age brackets did list financing their education and scheduling school as important concerns.

Faculty

A comparison of male and female faculty perceptions of adult student concerns appears in Table 18. More female faculty members listed opposition from family members, isolation and fear of failure in the 4.00-5.99 intervals than did their male counterparts; they also thought that financing school was a greater concern than did the males. Male faculty members listed learning how to study as a significantly higher concern than did females.

Table 19 compares faculty perceptions of adult student concerns by the number of years served as an academic advisor. Again, new advisors most often rate concerns at a higher level than do other faculty members; however, all faculty advisors' ratings are generally higher than student ratings for same items.

SUMMARY

This study investigated adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising at Metropolitan State University. Two null hypotheses, comparing student and faculty responses on important aspects of academic advising and adult student concerns were analyzed. Responses to questions concerning advisor/advisee contact and additional student services were discussed. Additional information, describing student responses to the study on the basis of sex and age and faculty responses on the basis of sex and number of years served as an advisor, was reported. A discussion of the study results and their implications will be presented in Chapter 5.

TABLE 18

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS, BY SEX,
OF ADULT STUDENT CONCERNS

<u>Items</u>	Not Important				Very Important
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Too Old</u>					
Males	---	30.0%	20.0%	30.0%	20.0%
Females	---	---	50.0	25.0	25.0
<u>Opposition From Family</u>					
Males	10.0	30.0	40.0	20.0	---
Females	---	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7
<u>Isolation</u>					
Males	11.1	77.8	11.1	---	---
Females	10.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	---
<u>Keeping Up With Younger Students</u>					
Males	11.1	44.4	11.1	22.0	11.1
Females	8.3	33.3	25.0	25.0	8.3
<u>Learning How To Study</u>					
Males	---	---	10.0	40.0	50.0
Females	---	8.3	16.7	41.7	33.3
<u>Financing School</u>					
Males	---	10.0	40.0	40.0	10.0
Females	---	16.7	8.3	41.7	33.3
<u>Scheduling School</u>					
Males	---	---	10.0	50.0	40.0
Females	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
<u>Poor Reading, Writing, Math Skills</u>					
Males	---	---	30.0	30.0	40.0
Females	---	9.1	18.2	27.3	45.5
<u>Fear of Failure</u>					
Males	---	---	44.4	33.3	22.2
Females	---	---	9.1	36.4	54.5
<u>Competition From Other Students</u>					
Males	---	12.5	62.5	25.0	---
Females	9.1	27.3	27.3	36.4	---
<u>Concern About Being Away From Family/Evenings</u>					
Males	---	---	80.0	10.0	10.0
Females	---	8.3	58.3	33.3	---

TABLE 19

A COMPARISON OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS,
BY YEARS SERVED AS ADVISORS,
OF ADULT STUDENT CONCERNS

	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5
Too Old					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	66.7%	---	33.3%
3-5	---	---	25.0	50.0	25.0
6-9	---	18.2	36.4	36.4	9.1
10 or more	---	25.0	25.0	---	50.0
Opposition From Family					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	100.0	---
3-5	25.0	50.0	---	25.0	---
6-9	---	36.4	45.5	9.1	9.1
10 or more	---	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Isolation					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	100.0	---
3-5	33.3	33.3	33.3	---	---
6-9	10.0	80.0	10.0	---	---
10 or more	---	33.3	33.3	33.3	---
Keeping Up With Younger Students					
0-2 Years Served	33.3	---	33.3	---	33.3
3-5	25.0	50.0	---	25.0	---
6-9	---	45.5	9.1	36.4	9.1
10 or more	---	33.3	66.7	---	---
Learning How To Study					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	66.7	33.3
3-5	---	---	---	25.0	75.0
6-9	---	9.1	9.1	45.5	36.4
10 or more	---	---	50.0	25.0	25.0
Financing School					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
3-5	---	25.0	---	25.0	50.0
6-9	---	18.2	27.3	45.5	9.1
10 or more	---	---	50.0	50.0	---
Scheduling School					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	66.7	33.3
3-5	---	---	---	50.0	50.0
6-9	---	---	9.1	27.3	63.6
10 or more	---	---	---	50.0	50.0
Poor Reading, Writing, Math Skills					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	33.3	---	66.7
3-5	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
6-9	---	9.1	27.3	36.4	27.3
10 or more	---	---	25.0	25.0	50.0
Fear of Failure					
0-2 Years Served	---	---	---	66.7	33.3
3-5	---	---	66.7	---	33.3
6-9	---	---	27.3	36.4	36.4
10 or more	---	---	---	33.3	66.7
Competition From Other Students					
0-2 Years Served	---	33.3	33.3	33.3	---
3-5	---	---	75.0	25.0	---
6-9	9.1	27.3	36.4	27.3	---
10 or more	---	---	---	---	100.0
Concern About Being Away From Family/Evenings					
0-2 Years Served	---	33.3	33.3	33.3	---
3-5	---	---	75.0	25.0	---
6-9	---	---	72.7	18.2	9.1
10 or more	---	---	75.0	25.0	---

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter reviews the purpose, methodology and analysis of the data compiled in this study. Conclusions drawn from the data, implications of the study and recommendations for further research are also discussed.

SUMMARY OF PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

Increasing numbers of adults are joining the student ranks in colleges and universities today. Little information exists concerning adult students and academic advising and there is a corresponding lack of data about adult advisee expectations and faculty perceptions of student expectations and concerns. This study was conceived and conducted in order to compare student and faculty expectations of academic advising in a public university whose mission is to serve adults. The research was limited to new adult students twenty-five years of age and older and permanent faculty members at Metropolitan State University. Four areas of advising were studied: important aspects of the academic advising process, adult student concerns as they return to school, advisor/advisee contact, and student services. A review of the literature was conducted in preparation for the research in which important aspects of academic advising, adult student concerns, and advising services for older students at other institutions were identified. Questionnaires designed for new students and faculty were administered by the writer to both groups during Spring quarter 1980. Multiple choice, Likert Scale, and checklist responses were included. Results were keypunched and computed.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program at the University of Minnesota was used. Descriptive statistics provided the basis for comparison and discussion of student and faculty expectations and the t-test was used to determine significant differences between the two populations in the categories of important aspects of academic advising and adult student concerns.

STUDY CONCLUSIONS

Important Aspects of Academic Advising

Through the literature fifteen important aspects of academic advising were identified and listed on the student and faculty questionnaires. Each of the fifteen items was either informational or developmental in nature. Using a five point Likert Scale, faculty ranked more of the advising factors higher on the interval scale than did students. There was a significant difference in student and faculty responses on five of the fifteen items. However, there was no mean ranking in either population below 3.00, an indication that the advising factors listed were important to both groups and did address students' needs and student and faculty expectations. Female faculty rated items on personal relationship, development of self-awareness, accessibility and career and graduate school information higher than their male colleagues. Male faculty members felt more strongly about being assigned to students because of similar educational or work background. New advisors (0-2 years experience) rated many of the advising aspect items higher than their more experienced counterparts, but were less inclined to place educational decision-making in the students' hands.

There were no major differences between male and female student respondents in their ratings of important aspects of advising; however,

females did list career information at a higher level on the scale and males were more interested than females in having advisors clarify university policies and procedures. It is significant that neither faculty nor students gave high ratings to development of self-awareness. The mean for both groups placed this item next to last in the rankings. Faculty also ranked personal relationships higher than did students.

Adult Student Concerns

In this category, differences were more dramatic between the two groups. Faculty thought that concerns listed were probably more important to adult students than the students themselves indicated. T-tests showed that faculty and students' responses were incongruent in seven of the eleven items listed. There appeared to be no differences based on age or sex in ratings of concern by students. Among faculty, however, women perceived issues such as opposition from family, isolation and fear of failure as more important than men perceived them. New advisors consistently rated the adult student concerns at a higher level than faculty with more advising experience did.

A review of the literature showed that in other studies on this topic two major adult student concerns have been financing school and trying to fit school into a personal schedule. This research supports those studies since Metropolitan State University students gave these concerns the highest ratings on the scales. However, it is clear in studying the rest of the data that new students at Metropolitan State University were not greatly concerned about items relating to lack of self-confidence, competition, age or study skills. It may be, as one woman suggested in her open-ended response, that these adult students have resolved many of those concerns before they reenter school. It has also been suggested that because Metro-

politan State University students are predominantly adult and because the institution is competence-based and uses a narrative evaluation rather than letter grades, students do not fear competition in the classroom. Their confidence may be higher too because they are surrounded by other adults.

Contact

Faculty were evenly divided on the question of number of meetings during the advisee's first year but new students generally wanted to see their advisors once a quarter. Approximately one-fourth of the students and the faculty agreed, however, that meetings held only by student request was the most appropriate choice for them. A majority of both faculty and students thought that there should be a telephone call or letter from the advisor on a regular basis. Students thought this contact should be once a quarter while most faculty thought twice a year was acceptable.

Student Services

Students responded to a checklist of additional student services they would use if offered through the Advising Office. Five services received the highest number of responses from the new Metropolitan State University students. They were job placement service, Saturday and evening advising hours, remediation workshops, tutoring and vocational testing. Additional advising hours, study skills workshops, tutoring and career development have been identified in studies, previously cited in the literature review, as important student services for adults. Metropolitan State University's student responses appear to support these reports.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Academic advising is becoming an increasingly important function in

colleges and universities as these institutions seek to attract enrollees, retain current students, supply accurate information about ever-increasing curriculum choices and meet the needs of diverse student populations. Since today's student body includes growing numbers of older students, it is important for advising practitioners and administrators to be aware of these students' advising expectations, concerns and needs and to examine their own expectations as advisors to this special population. While this study on adult student and faculty expectations is limited to Metropolitan State University, some of the findings and their implications may be useful to others who are working in an advising capacity with older students. The following implications are suggested:

- (1) New students and faculty alike at Metropolitan State University are interested in the advising process and think that most of the aspects listed are important to them.
- (2) Faculty in this study appear to be sensitive to the roles they should play as advisors. However, if an academic advisor is to be responsible for all of the aspects listed, including information on specific courses, career and community resources, advocacy, and personal knowledge of the student's progress, considerable ongoing training must be offered. Most faculty members have not been prepared during their graduate school years for positions as academic advisors. Special training in adult learning theory, adult development and counseling techniques, including the short helping interview, would be useful. Integrated advising delivery systems must also be designed and utilized to meet adult student needs, including use of computer-assisted advising, so that advisors need not

be responsible for every aspect of the advising process.

- (3) While faculty advisor responses in this study give a clear indication that they are conscientious and concerned about their advising responsibilities, it seems important to recognize that not every faculty member wishes to advise students. This should be taken into account in the selection process and efforts should be made to match advisors with appropriate advisees, perhaps on the basis of similar work or educational background, sex or even age.
- (4) Scheduling time for school and financing education were the major concerns expressed by the students who responded to this study. Advisors should be aware of both of these issues and could be particularly helpful in assisting an advisee in dealing with scheduling constraints and time management. Financial aids officers and personnel should advocate for more loans or grants for adults, including part-time students.
- (5) Many adult students want to develop or change careers and they expect some assistance from their college or university in doing so. Administrators should consider ways in which to establish a job placement service or to develop community resources to serve this need. Vocational testing might be a part of this service or could be offered during the school orientation as an option.
- (6) Saturday and evening advising hours should be a part of regular student services offered to adults in colleges and universities.
- (7) Provision should be made for student tutorial workshops. Peer

tutors in specific subject areas could be recruited.

- (8) In this study most new students indicated that they would like to see an advisor once a quarter during their first year. However, one-fourth of the respondents indicated that meetings only on request were sufficient. In advising the older student, it is reasonable to assume that many adults have their educational goals firmly in mind. They may not feel a need for advising services on a regular basis.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Little research has been reported on adults and academic advising. Most studies deal with delivery systems and special programs. Additional research needs to be conducted on adult student expectations of the process and on adult student satisfaction with the advising they receive. Other institutions could develop instruments to survey their own adult student populations as to advising needs and concerns so that they can adapt their service systems to this diverse group. It would be useful, too, to administer a questionnaire such as the one developed for this study to new and current adult student random samples to see if there are any differences in advising expectations after a year or two in the university's advising system.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that advising is an important function within a university and that faculty and students alike have high expectations of the process. However, advising is a complex process, particularly in an institution like Metropolitan State University, where the student and advisor take responsibility for the continued development of

individualized learning programs. It requires a high level of communication skills on the part of the advisor and a ready access to specific and accurate information about the institution and the community. If advisors are to meet adult student expectations, ongoing training must be offered in institutional policies and procedures, in curriculum and community resources, in adult development, and in helping skills. Advising systems must also be diversified in order to meet adult student needs. This will require additional administrative and faculty commitment. Because academic advising is such an integral part of the teaching-learning process within colleges and universities, it seems worthwhile that we as individual advisors and as administrators, make such a commitment in order to ensure effective academic advising for older students in the years ahead.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- _____. "Adult Needs Bring Over-25s Back to Campus." St. Paul Pioneer Press, January 27, 1980.
- Alberti, R.E. "Influence of the Faculty on College Student Development." Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:18-23, January, 1972.
- Algier, Ann S. "A New Approach to Academic Rehabilitation." Educational Record, 53:80-84, Winter, 1972.
- Allan, Thomas. Analysis of the Academic Advisement Process. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 133 632, June, 1977.
- Appleton, James R., Moore, Paul L., and John C. Vinton. "A Model for the Effective Delivery of Student Services in Academic Schools and Departments." Journal of Higher Education, 49:372-381, July/August, 1978.
- Apps, Jerold W. "Six Influences on Adult Education in the 1980's." Life-long Learning: The Adult Years, 30:4-7, June, 1980.
- Astin, Alexander W. Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- _____. Basic Elements in Developing and Implementing a Successful Academic Advising Program. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- Beal, Phillip E., and Lee Noel. What Works in Student Retention, A Preliminary Summary of a National Survey. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1979.
- Berdie, R.F. "Counseling and Liberal Education." Journal of College Student Personnel, 16:3-9, January, 1975.
- Bess, James L. "Integrating Faculty and Student Life Cycles." Review of Educational Research, 43:377-403, Fall, 1973.
- Betz, Ellen L., Starr, Ann M., and John W. Menne. "College Student Status in Ten Public and Private Colleges and Universities." Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:456-461, September, 1972.
- Bevilacqua, Joseph P. "The Changing Relationship Between the University and the Student: Implications for Student Personnel Work." Journal of College Student Personnel, 17:489-494, November, 1976.
- Biggs, Donald A., Brodie, J.S., and W.J. Barnhart. "The Dynamics of Undergraduate Academic Advising." Research in Higher Education, 3:345-357, December, 1975.

- Bishop, John, and Jane Van Dyk. "Can Adults Be Hooked on College? Some Determinants of Adult College Attendance." Journal of Higher Education, 48:39-62, January/February, 1977.
- Bondeson, William. "Open Learning: Curricula, Courses and Credibility." Journal of Higher Education, 48:96-103, January/February, 1977.
- Borgard, John R., Hornbuckle, Phyllis A., and John Maloney. "Faculty Perceptions of Academic Advising." NASPA Journal, 14:4-10, Winter, 1977.
- Borland, David T. "Curricular Planning Through Creative Academic Advising." NASPA Journal, 10:211-217, January, 1973.
- Bostaph, C.P. "A Study of Student Attitudes Towards Three Different Academic Advising Systems Currently Used in Three Different Undergraduate Schools at the University of Pittsburgh." PhD dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1976.
- Brady, Susan M. "Academic Advising: A Study of Faculty Goals and Student Needs." PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1978.
- Bromfield, Sandra and James A. Kilmurray. "Learning to Decide: New Ways to Counsel Non-Traditional Students." College Board Review, 100:26-28, Summer, 1976.
- Brown, Coke R., and Rosemary Myers. "Student versus Faculty Curriculum Advising." Journal of College Student Personnel, 16:226-231, May, 1975.
- Brown, Thomas. "Counseling Adults with Educational Problems." Counseling Services for Adults, Martha Farmer (editor), Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1971.
- Brownlee, Patricia A. "A Study of Freshman Satisfaction with Academic Advising in Selected Private Liberal Arts Colleges in the State of Minnesota." PhD dissertation, Florida State University, 1977.
- Buckey, Amy, Freeark, Kris, and Jean O'Barr. "Support for Returning Students." Adult Leadership, 25:1:21-23, September, 1973.
- Bulpitt, Mildred. "The Adult Student." New Directions for Community Colleges, 1:3:55-69, Autumn, 1973.
- Carstensen, Donald J., and Constance Silberhorn. A National Survey of Academic Advising: Final Report. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, October, 1979.
- Centra, John A. "Reading the Enrollment Barometer." Change, 11:51-52, 62, April 15, 1979.
- Chickering, Arthur W. "College Advising for the 1970's." Services for Students, Joseph Katz (editor), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

- Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Chitayat, Deanna, and Sharon Hymer. "The New Occupational Student: The Mature Woman. A Pre-Admission Counseling Program in Four CUNY Community Colleges." U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 138-877, October, 1977.
- Clarke, John, and Toni Trombley. "Student Self-Assessment Systems and Academic Advising." Paper presented at the Second National Conference on Academic Advising, Memphis, Tennessee, October, 1978.
- Coyle, T.H. "Students Expect Teachers to do More Than Teach." Journal of College Student Personnel, 12:1:58-61, January, 1971.
- Crockett, David S. "Academic Advising: A Cornerstone of Student Retention." New Directions for Student Services, 3:29-35, 1978a.
- Crockett, David S., ed. Academic Advising - A Resource Document. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978b.
- Crockett, David S., ed. Academic Advising - A Resource Document. 1979 Supplement. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.
- Crockett, David S. Advising Skills, Techniques and Resources. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, September, 1978c.
- Crockett, David S. Trends in Higher Education. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, July, 1978d.
- Crookston, Burns B. "A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching." Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:1:12-17, January, 1972a.
- Crookston, Burns B. "An Organizational Model for Student Development." NASPA Journal, 10:1:3-13, July, 1972b.
- Dameron, J.D., and J.C. Wolf. "Academic Advisement in Higher Education: A New Model." Journal of College Student Personnel, 15:6:470-473, November, 1974.
- Davis, Carol A. "Building a Model Academic Advising Program for the Community College." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- Decker, J.J., Redhorse, J.R., and G.R. Lucas. "The Advising System: An Alternative Model Related to the Evaluation of Self-Directed Learning," Alternative Higher Education, 3:2:68-74, Winter, 1978.
- DeLong, Donald L. "Academic Advising vs. Academic Counseling." Academic Advising - A Resource Document. David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

- Dolan, Eleanor F. Counseling Techniques for Mature Women, Report of the Adult Counselor Program. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 014 106, April, 1968.
- Eddy, Margot S. Part-Time Students. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 163 831, May, 1979.
- Elledge, Murial. The Development of Guidelines for Community College Peer Group Counseling Evolving from a Study of Programs for Adult Re-Entry Women. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 154 853, October, 1978.
- Fauquet, Tom. Report of Results of a Questionnaire on Student Development Services for Older Students in Florida's Community Colleges. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 153 158, September, 1978.
- Fisher, Joseph A. Yesterday's Student-Tomorrow's Challenge. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 149 305, June, 1978.
- Fletcher, Robert, and Michael McCauley. "University-Wide Centralized/Specialized Academic Advising: An Integrated Approach." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- Garfield, Learita, and Elizabeth McHugh. "Learning Counseling: A Higher Education Student Support Service." Journal of Higher Education, 49:4:382-392, July/August, 1978.
- Gibson, Gordon. A Meta-Presentation of a Theoretical and Research Base for Academic Advisement. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 085 621, May, 1974.
- Geisler, Margaret P., and Randolph S. Thrush. "Counseling Experiences and Needs of Older Women Students." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 39:1:3-7, Fall, 1975.
- Glennon, Robert E. Faculty Counseling: An Important and Effective Aspect of Student Development. U.S., Educational Resource Information Center, ERIC Document ED 057 368, April, 1972.
- Glennon, Robert E. "Intrusive College Counseling." The School Counselor, 24:1:48-50, September, 1976.
- Goldberg, Joan C. "Counseling the Adult Learner: A Selective Review of the Literature." Adult Education, 30:2:67-81, Winter, 1980.
- Gould, Roger. Transformations: Growth and Change in Adult Life. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1978.
- Grabowski, Stanley M. "Educational Counseling of Adults." Adult Leadership, 24:7:225-227, 249, March, 1976.

- Griswold, Kenneth W. "Counseling and Adult Students." Adult Leadership, 20:3:103-104, September, 1971.
- Grites, Thomas J. Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education--ERIC Higher Education Research Report Number 7, November, 1979.
- Grites, Thomas J. "Student Development Through Academic Advising: A 4 x 4 Model." NASPA Journal, 14:33-37, Winter, 1977a.
- Grites, Thomas J. "Student Perceptions and Self-Perceptions of Faculty Members in the Related Roles of Classroom Teacher and Academic Advisor." PhD dissertation, University of Maryland, 1974.
- Grites, Thomas J. The 4 x 4 Model for Student Development. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 133 633, June, 1977b.
- Hale, Lester L. "A Bold New Blueprint for Career Planning and Placement." Journal of College Placement, 34:34-40, 68-74, December, 1973-January, 1974 and Spring, 1974.
- Hardee, Melvane D. Faculty Advising in Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, Student Personnel Series No. 9, 1970.
- Harris, Susan, and Sherrill Kuckuck. Orientation and Extra Curricular Programming for Students Over Thirty. U.S., Education Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 108 091, November, 1975.
- Hartwig, John E. An Investigation of Adult Counseling and Guidance Programs in the Nineteen Public Community Junior Colleges in the State of Kansas. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 089 821, August, 1974.
- Harvey, T.R. "Some Future Directions for Student Personnel Administrators." Journal of College Student Personnel, 15:4:243-247, July, 1974.
- Heffernan, James M., Macy, Francis U., and Donn F. Vickers. Educational Brokering: A New Service for Adult Learners. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 138 750, October, 1977.
- Heitzman, Dennis. "Integrating Academic Counseling into the Center for Student Development." Academic Advising- A Resource Document, 1979 Supplement, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.
- Hengesbach, Theodore. Adult Student Needs and University Responses. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 164 829, June, 1979.
- Hennessey, Mary D. "Some Theoretical and Practical Considerations for Advising Adult Students." Academic Advising- A Resource Document, 1979 Supplement, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.

- Holtzclaw, Louis R. "The Adult Learner's Need for Inner Freedom." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 24:18-19, September, 1979.
- Hutchins, David E., and William B. Miller. "Group Interaction as a Vehicle to Facilitate Faculty-Student Advisement." Journal of College Student Personnel, 20:253-257, May, 1979.
- Isaac, Stephen, and W.B. Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Edits Publishers, 1977 edition.
- Jody, Marilyn. "An Integrated Approach to Academic Advisement." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- Johnson, Deborah H., Weiss, Karen L., and William E. Sedlacek. A Comparison of the Needs of Returning and Traditional Students by Sex. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 165 611, June, 1979.
- Kasworm, Carol E. Student Personnel Professionals as Continuing Educators. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 159 498, February, 1979.
- Kaufman, P.J., and A.J. Netusil. Selected Communication Variables and their Effect on Advisee Satisfaction with Advisor-Advisee Conferences. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 106 701. October, 1975.
- Knox, Alan. Adult Development and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Kopplin, D.A., and L.C. Rice. "Counseling with Faculty: Necessary and Possible." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53:5:367-372, January, 1975.
- Kramer, Howard C. "Futuristic Services: One Perspective." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 38:2:80-86, Winter, 1975.
- Kramer, Howard C., and Robert C. Gardner. Advising By Faculty. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association Publication, 1977.
- Kramer, Howard C., and Robert C. Gardner. "Advising Survey Form." Cornell University: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education (Questionnaire), 1978a.
- Kramer, Howard C., and Robert C. Gardner. Managing Faculty Advising. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1978b.
- Lacher, M.R.B. "On Advising Undergraduate Women: A Psychologist's Advice to Academic Advisors." Journal of College Student Personnel, 19:6:488-493, November, 1978.
- Levinson, Daniel. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.

- Lourie, Joan. Needs and Social Characteristics of the Re-Entered Student. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 160 808, March, 1979.
- McCannon, Roger S. Effectiveness of an Orientation and Counseling Program for Adult Evening Students at Drake University. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 110 842, January, 1976.
- Magarell, Jack. "More People Over 25 Are Going to College." Chronicle of Higher Education, April 10, 1978.
- Mahoney, John, Borgard, John H., and Phyllis A. Hornbuckle. "The Relationship of Faculty Experience and Advisee Load to Perceptions of Academic Advising." Journal of College Student Personnel, 19:28-32, January, 1978.
- Mash, Donald J. "Academic Advising: Too Often Taken for Granted." The College Board Review, 107:32-36, Spring, 1978.
- _____. Metropolitan State University, Self-Study Report. Minneapolis-St. Paul: March, 1980.
- Metz, Joseph F. "Toward a Definition of Advising." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, David S. Crockett, (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- Metz, Thomas. "Characteristics of a Good Advisor." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- Miller, Theodore K., and Judith S. Prince. The Future of Student Affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Morris, Charles G. "Academic Advising and Counseling." Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan College of Literature, Science and the Arts, 1973a. (Mimeographed.)
- Morris, Charles G. "Student Questionnaire: College of Literature, Science and the Arts." Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1973b.
- Morstain, Barry R. "An Analysis of Students' Satisfaction with their Academic Program." Journal of Higher Education, 48:1-16, January/February, 1977.
- Mulligan, Michael. "Helping Skills for Advisors." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- _____. Counseling and Interviewing Adult Students. National Association for Public, Continuing and Adult Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 042 118, January, 1971.
- O'Banion, Terry. "An Academic Advising Model." Junior College Journal, 42:62-69, March, 1972.

- Orlich, Donald. Designing Sensible Surveys. Pleasantville, New York: Redgrave Publishing Company, 1978.
- Pascarella, E.T., and P.T. Terenzini. "Student-Faculty Informal Relationships and Freshman Year Educational Outcomes." Journal of Educational Research, 71:4:183-189, March/April, 1978.
- Penn, J.R., and Doris A. Weaver. "Adult Students' Problems, Practices and Programs at Four Year Institutions." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors. 42:3:32-38, Spring, 1979.
- Peterson, A.G. "The College Advisement Survey: An Inventory of Student Perceptions of College Advisement." PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, 1970.
- Plotsky, Frances A. SOTA, Students Older Than Average, A Social Group. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 138 916, October, 1977.
- Potter, E. Bruce. "On Developing an Effective Decentralized Advisement System." Academic Advising- A Resource Document, 1979 Supplement, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.
- _____. Reducing the Dropout Rate, Campus Level Retention Strategies and Action Programs. Iowa City: The American College Testing National Center for Education and Conferences, 1979.
- Robinson, Jane. "Oldies but Goodies." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 43:3:27-32, Spring, 1980.
- Roelfs, Pamela. Teaching and Counseling Older College Students. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 130 737, March, 1977.
- Rosenberg, Guy L. "A Study of Undergraduate Academic Advising in a University Setting." PhD dissertation, University of Iowa, 1969.
- Rozzelle, Robert, and H.D. Pfeifer. "Freshman Academic Advising at Wichita State University." Academic Advising- A Resource Document, 1979 Supplement. David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979.
- Radnick, Arthur W. Jr. "Advising from the Faculty Perspective." Academic Advising- A Resource Document, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.
- Schlaver, David E. The Uncommon School. The Adult Learner in the University. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 145 755, March, 1978.

- Schlossberg, Nancy K., and A.D. Entine, eds. Counseling Adults. Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1977.
- Schlossberg, Nancy K. "Five Propositions about Adult Development." Journal of College Student Personnel, 19:5:418-423, September, 1978.
- Schlossberg, Nancy K. "Programs for Adults." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53:9:681-685, May, 1975.
- Schwarz, D.G. "Identification and Analysis of the Advisor-Student Interpersonal Relationship." PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1972.
- Smallwood, Kathie B. "What Do Adult Women College Students Really Need?" Journal of College Student Personnel, 21:1:65-73, January, 1980.
- Smydra, Martha, and Edith Kochenour. A Summary of a Study of Adult Students at Jefferson Community College. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 165 818, June, 1979.
- Somogyi, R.J., and E.H. Draheim. The Non-Traditional Student. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 149 809, June, 1978.
- Starr, Ann M., Betz, Ellen L., and John W. Menne. "Differences in College Student Satisfaction: Academic Dropouts, Non-Academic Dropouts and Non-Dropouts." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19:4:318-322, July 1972.
- Stein, Gordon B., and Henry A. Spille. "Academic Advising Reaches Out." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 53:1:61-64, September, 1974.
- Stewart, David, and Michael Richardson. "Counseling and Advising Services for Adult Learners--An Open University Perspective." International Review of Education, 23:4:425-437, 1977.
- Teague, G.V. "Community College Student Satisfaction with Four Types of Academic Advisement." Journal of College Student Personnel, 18:4:281-285, July, 1977.
- Thompson, Carmen, and David Jensen. Community-Based Educational Counseling for Adults. U.S., Educational Resources Center, ERIC Document ED 138 784, October, 1977.
- Thompson, Clarence H. College Student Personnel Services for the Adult. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 021 287, January, 1969.
- Thompson, Clarence H. Counseling the Adult Student, Report of Commission Thirteen on Student Personnel Work for Adults in Higher Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 012 857, February, 1968.

Tiede, L. T. "A Study of Faculty and Student Perceptions of the Faculty Advisement Programs at Three Small Independent Liberal Arts Colleges." PhD dissertation, Marquette University, 1976.

Titley, Bonnie S. "Academic Advising: Training and/or Education." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1978.

Titley, Bonnie S. "Creativity and Decision-Making in Academic Advising: A Proposed Model for Practical Application." PhD project in lieu of dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1976.

Trombley, Toni. "The Advising Referral Center at the University of Vermont." Academic Advising - A Resource Document, 1979 Supplement, David S. Crockett (editor), Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1979a.

Trombley, Toni. "A Primary Component of Effective Faculty Advising Training Programs: Assessing and Improving Personal Skills." Paper presented at the 7th National Conference on Academic Advising, Omaha, Nebraska, October, 1979b.

Turner, Moses. "Student Satisfaction and Dissatisfactions with the Curriculum Advisory Program at Washington State University." PhD dissertation, Washington State University, 1975.

Wells, T.L. "The Development of an Inter-Institutional Model for a Non-Traditional Advising System for Non-Traditional Students." PhD dissertation, University of Alabama, 1976.

Witters, L.A., and H.G. Miller. "College Advising: An Analysis of Advisor-Advisee Roles." Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education, 9:2:36-40, Winter, 1971.

APPENDIX A

Spring 1980

Dear Student:

The Advising Office at Metropolitan State University is interested in learning more about your expectations of academic advising. What factors in academic advising are important to you? What concerns have you had as you return to school? What services should the Advising Office provide to you? All students, twenty-five years of age and older, are being asked to complete this questionnaire in the Individualized Educational Planning course during spring quarter 1980. The information you provide will be reported as part of a research project, and will be helpful to faculty and staff who act as academic advisors. All of the information received will be confidential, and will be used for aggregate analysis only. It will not become part of any permanent file relating to you. Your response will be anonymous, and participation is voluntary. You may withdraw at any time, and you may refuse to respond to any particular question without prejudice.

If you have questions concerning the study, please contact Carol Ryan, Advising Desk, Metropolitan State University, 296-4725. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Carol Ryan
Advising Office
Metropolitan State University

ACADEMIC ADVISING STUDENT SURVEY
Advising Office
Metropolitan State University

92

This questionnaire has been designed to assess your expectations of academic advising.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Directions: Please check the appropriate responses to questions 1 through 5.

1. Sex: () Male () Female
2. Age at Last Birthday: { } 25-29 { } 40-44 { } 55-59
 { } 30-34 { } 45-49 { } 60-64
 { } 35-39 { } 50-54 { } 65 and over
3. After your degree plan is accepted, an academic advisor will be assigned to you. How often do you think you would like to meet with your advisor during your first year as a Metro U student?
 - a. { } Once a quarter
 - b. { } Twice a year
 - c. { } Once a year
 - d. { } It is necessary to meet only if I request a meeting.
4. Would you like your advisor to contact you, by telephone or letter, on a regular basis?
 - a. () Yes
 - b. () No
5. If yes, how often?
 - a. { } Once a quarter
 - b. { } Twice a year
 - c. () Once a year

II. ACADEMIC ADVISING

The following phrases are used to describe important aspects of academic advising. Based on your expectations of your needs for advising, how important are each of these factors to you?

Directions: Please respond to items 1 through 15 by placing an X in the bracket on the scale that best represents the degree of importance to you.

	Not Important			Very Important	
	1	2	3	4	5
An advisor should:					
1. Contact me if I have been inactive.....	()	()	()	()	()
2. Be aware of my progress on my degree plan.....	()	()	()	()	()
3. Put educational decision-making into my hands.....	()	()	()	()	()
4. Be aware of other factors in my life besides Metro U (e.g., family, job).....	()	()	()	()	()
5. Provide career information to me (e.g., new careers, careers within a field of interest, career reentry, vocational testing resources).....	()	()	()	()	()
6. Tell me about graduate school program resources.....	()	()	()	()	()
7. Be my advocate within the university.....	()	()	()	()	()
8. Clarify university policies and procedures.....	()	()	()	()	()
9. Relate to me in a personal way.....	()	()	()	()	()
10. Help me understand the relationship between my career goals, or work, and liberal learning (e.g., humanities, fine arts, social sciences).....	()	()	()	()	()
11. Make learning opportunities known to me (e.g., internships, community resources).....	()	()	()	()	()
12. Help me develop self-awareness.....	()	()	()	()	()
13. Inform me of times when I can call or come in.....	()	()	()	()	()
14. Be assigned to me because of similar work or educational background in the field in which I am interested.....	()	()	()	()	()
15. Help me with specific course scheduling.....	()	()	()	()	()
16. Other (please list) _____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()

III. RETURN TO SCHOOL

Adults have sometimes expressed concerns about coming back to school. How important is each of these concerns to you?

Directions: Please respond to items 1 through 12 by placing an X in the bracket on the scale that best represents the degree of concern to you.

	Not Important			Very Important	
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Fear that I might be too old to go back to school	()	()	()	()	()
2. Opposition from family members.....	()	()	()	()	()
3. Isolation from family and friends.....	()	()	()	()	()
4. Keeping up with younger students.....	()	()	()	()	()
5. Learning how to study.....	()	()	()	()	()
6. Financing school.....	()	()	()	()	()
7. Trying to fit school into my schedule.....	()	()	()	()	()
8. Poor reading, writing or math skills.....	()	()	()	()	()
9. Fear of failure.....	()	()	()	()	()
10. Competition from other students.....	()	()	()	()	()
11. Concern about being away from my family in the evenings.....	()	()	()	()	()
12. Other (please list) _____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()

IV. ADVISING OFFICE SERVICES

The Advising Office provides support services to students such as referrals for psychological counseling, the Advising Desk, and the Used Book Exchange. What other services would you USE if they were offered? Please check.

1.	()	Student Support Groups
2.	()	A Student Meeting Room
3.	()	Vocational Testing
4.	()	Saturday and Evening Advising Hours
5.	()	Tutoring
6.	()	Student or Peer Advisors
7.	()	Job Placement Service
8.	()	Remediation (math, reading, writing skills) Workshops
9.	()	Counseling for Personal Problems
10.	()	Other (please list) _____

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY

Return To: Carol Ryan
Advising Office
Metropolitan State University
121 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

APPENDIX B

Spring 1980

Dear Colleague:

The Advising Office at Metropolitan State University is interested in learning more about adult student and faculty expectations of academic advising. All new IEP students, ages twenty-five and over, are being asked to complete this survey during spring quarter 1980. Faculty are also being asked to consider what factors are important in advising students, and you, as a member of the faculty, are being asked to complete the attached questionnaire. The information you provide will be reported as part of my Master's thesis, and your help is earnestly requested. When all of the data are compiled, I will report to you. All of the information received will be confidential, and will be used for aggregate analysis only. It will not become part of any permanent file relating to you. Your responses will be anonymous and participation is voluntary. You may withdraw at any time and you may refuse to respond to any particular question without prejudice.

If you have any questions about the study, I would be happy to answer them now. If you prefer, you may call me at 296-4725. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Carol Ryan
Advising Office
Metropolitan State University

This survey has been designed to assess faculty expectations of academic advising.

I. ADVISEE COMMUNICATION

Directions: Please check the appropriate responses to questions 1 through 3.

1. After a student's degree plan is accepted, he/she will be assigned to you as an advisee. How often do you think you would like to meet with an advisee during his/her first four quarters as a Metro U student ?
 - a. ☐ Once a quarter
 - b. ☐ Twice a year
 - c. ☐ Once a year
 - d. ☐ Only necessary if the student requests a meeting
2. Do you think you should contact your advisees, by telephone or letter, on a regular basis?
 - a. ☐ Yes
 - b. ☐ No
3. If yes, how often?
 - a. ☐ Once a quarter
 - b. ☐ Twice a year
 - c. ☐ Once a year

II. ACADEMIC ADVISING

The following phrases have been used in the literature to describe some aspects of academic advising. Based on your expectations of what should take place in advising, how important are these factors to you?

Directions: Please respond to items 1 through 15 by placing an X in the bracket on the scale that best represents the degree of importance to you.

As an advisor, I should:	Not Important		3	Very Important	
	1	2		4	5
1. Contact an advisee who has been inactive.....	()	()	()	()	()
2. Be aware of the advisee's progress on the degree plan.....	()	()	()	()	()
3. Put educational decision-making into the advisee's hands.....	()	()	()	()	()
4. Be aware of other factors in the advisee's life (e.g., family, job)	()	()	()	()	()
5. Provide career information (e.g., new careers, career reentry information, careers within a field of interest, vocational testing resources).....	()	()	()	()	()
6. Tell the advisee about graduate program resources.....	()	()	()	()	()
7. Be an advocate for the advisee within the university.....	()	()	()	()	()
8. Clarify university policies and procedures.....	()	()	()	()	()
9. Relate to the advisee in a personal way.....	()	()	()	()	()
10. Help the advisee understand the relationship between his/her career goals, or work, and liberal learning (e.g., humanities, fine arts, social sciences).....	()	()	()	()	()
11. Make learning opportunities known to the advisee (e.g., internships, community resources).....	()	()	()	()	()
12. Help the advisee develop self-awareness.....	()	()	()	()	()
13. Inform advisee of times when available for calls or meetings.....	()	()	()	()	()
14. Be assigned to the advisee because of similar work or educational background.....	()	()	()	()	()
15. Help with specific course scheduling.....	()	()	()	()	()
16. Other (please list) _____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()

- OVER -

III. RETURN TO SCHOOL

The following adult student concerns about returning to school have been identified in the literature. Based on your experience as an advisor, how important do you think these concerns are to your advisees?

Directions: Please respond to items 1 through 12 by placing an X in the bracket on the scale that best represents the degree of concern.

	Not Important			Very Important	
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Fear of being too old to go back to school	()	()	()	()	()
2. Opposition from family members.....	()	()	()	()	()
3. Isolation from family and friends.....	()	()	()	()	()
4. Keeping up with younger students.....	()	()	()	()	()
5. Learning how to study.....	()	()	()	()	()
6. Financing school.....	()	()	()	()	()
7. Trying to fit school into personal schedule.....	()	()	()	()	()
8. Poor reading, writing or math skills.....	()	()	()	()	()
9. Fear of failure.....	()	()	()	()	()
10. Competition from other students.....	()	()	()	()	()
11. Concern about being away from my family in the evenings.....	()	()	()	()	()
12. Other (please list) _____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()
_____	()	()	()	()	()

IV. GENERAL INFORMATION

Directions: Please check the appropriate responses to the following questions.

1. How many years of academic advising experience have you had at Metro U and at other colleges and universities?

a. { } 0-2
b. { } 3-5

c. { } 6-9
d. { } 10 or more

2. Sex: () Male () Female

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY

Return To: Carol Ryan
Advising Office
Metropolitan State University
121 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101